

THE
JOURNAL OF
THE
AMERICAN
PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
Bulletin

VOLUME VI

NUMBER 1

MARCH, 1900

CONTENTS

Sixth Annual Meeting

HELD AT

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, JANUARY 2 & 3, 1900



Published quarterly, except the June issue, by the American Psychological Association,
under the act of March 3, 1907

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

PRESIDENT:

Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

VICE-PRESIDENT:

Henry Louis Smith, Washington and Lee University,
Lexington, Va.

SECRETARY-TREASURER:

Raymond M. Hughes, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

William A. Shanklin, Wesleyan University, Middle-
town, Connecticut.

William W. Boyd, Western College for Women, Ox-
ford, Ohio.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:

Robert L. Kelly, 45 W. 18th St., New York City.

REPRESENTATIVES TO AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION:

For one year, William W. Guth, Goucher College, Bal-
timore, Maryland.

For two years, Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College,
Northfield, Minnesota.

For three years, Rush Rhees, University of Rochester,
Rochester, N. Y.

**ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
BULLETIN**

Vol. VI

March, 1920

No. 2

**ADDRESSES AT
Sixth Annual Meeting**

Edited by

Raymond M. Hughes
Oxford, Ohio
Secretary of the Association

Published by

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

February, March, April and November

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

**Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois,
under Act of March 3, 1879**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
The College and World Leadership	
1. Henry Churchill King	3
2. Mary E. Woolley	7
3. Henry Louis Smith	12
4. Leonard Wood	17
International Educational Relations	
1. Robert L. Kelly	28
2. Charles D. Hurrey	37
3. Frank Aydelotte	42
4. George H. Nettleton	49
5. Stephen P. Duggan	56
6. Samuel P. Capen	64
7. J. J. Champenois	68
8. Arthur Percival Newton	75
9. K. J. Saunders	79
10. Bruno Roselli	83
The Religious Impulse in Education	
Lynn Harold Hough	101
The American Council on Education	
Samuel P. Capen	109
The College and the Economic Situation	
1. A. B. Storms	112
2. J. L. McConaughy	119
The Post-War Curriculum	
1. Mary A. Molloy	125
2. William W. Guth	134
Architecture	
Henry K. Holsman	138

THE COLLEGE AND WORLD LEADERSHIP

I. President Henry Churchill King, Oberlin College

Your President has asked me to discuss this topic of "The College and World Leadership" from the point of view of "Religious Reconstruction," and perhaps I cannot do better, from that viewpoint, than to take as the text of this necessarily brief discussion, three paragraphs from what I think is one of the most remarkable editorials of the entire war—the editorial which appeared in the *New Republic* for December 21, 1918, under the title "*The Greatest of These.*" The first paragraph gives a diagnosis of the situation; the second paragraph, the remedy; and the third, the justification. The *New Republic* is not over-much given to religion, but I do not think that it can be doubted that this radical and far-seeing editor has gone a long ways in this editorial toward penetrating to the bottom of our present need, if we are going to have a world leadership worth talking about.

First, the diagnosis: "The starvation, the anarchy and the bankruptcy which are now threatening Europe may, in the end, arouse more enduring hatreds, work results more menacing to the future of civilization than war itself. Although the fighting is over, there is no peace in the world, little confidence in one another or in the future, little common understanding and good will."

This radical political editor then goes on to indicate what he thinks is the remedy: "Christians who have lifted the veil and looked into the face of Christ must believe that the imitation of Christ is precisely and entirely what the Christian peoples need to deliver them from the bondage of their bankrupt social economy, from the least tolerable of their present sufferings and from the dread of impending calamity."

Then, the justification: "There is nothing in modern social knowledge which discourages us from seeking individual and social deliverance through the imitation of Christ. On the contrary, modern psychology, modern penology and modern education all recommend a way of enhancing human life which seeks to release men and women from fears, hatreds, suspicions, greeds and debts to their own past."

I might almost be contented to stop with my text, if you have really sensed what underlies those three paragraphs. For it mightily concerns us all to see the *fundamentally moral and religious conditions of any real world betterment*. But I will ask you to think for a few moments of five or six considerations, in which perhaps some conditions of world leadership, as they concern the college, are to be found.

1. And first of all, without the slightest desire to stir the ashes of race hatred, I ought to remind you, I think, if we are going to talk about world leadership, to any purpose, *how frightfully near the world came to the triumph of an essentially anti-Christian interpretation of civilization and of national life*. For we came to see that we were fighting against a nation whose mind had been thoroughly imbued with two things: First, the settled conviction that the State was above all moral standards; and second, a deliberately materialistic interpretation of the survival of the fittest. For the world has never seen so conscious and deliberate an attempt to reverse the moral standards of the race. That means, that the Christianization of our civilization, up to that point, had been so superficial that it was just barely able, one may say, to maintain itself in existence.

Now, that shows how deep-going is the need which Christianity and the Christian college must meet, if they are to retain or to attain anything like a world leadership.

2. The second suggestion that I have to make is that this terrible war brought home to us as never before *the power of education*. I think the world has never had such

a demonstration of the power of education as the German nation showed—drilled from kindergarten to university into their materialistic view of the state and of the survival of the fittest; drilled into it until practically the whole nation had its hopes and its ideals changed—until the whole nation responded with one formula, one mood, almost with one gesture. It was, of course, a kind of mechanical and monstrous thing. But I remind you that we have never had such a proof of the stupendous power of education. And if education can be made so powerful on the wrong side, it can achieve a like power on the right side. It is peculiarly the business of the Christian college to see that Christian education is made a mighty power.

3. And this leads me to the third suggestion that I have to make. I am afraid we must confess *the comparative failure of our education on the ideal side*. As an educator, I say that with reluctance, and I do not mean to be pessimistic in it. But I am afraid that we can not deny that we have not succeeded in permeating our American youth with the deeper and finer aspects of education, in the degree we had hoped was true. I fear we must admit that many of our American soldiers never got clearly into mind the real aims of the war; never clearly perceived what the essential elements of democracy itself are. They did not quite grasp those great moral and religious principles that were involved in the war. It may well challenge our attention that the British "Committee on the Army and Religion," in their exhaustive report, bear testimony that perhaps the most certain result of their whole examination of the British Army from the religious point of view was the truly appalling ignorance of the common British soldier of what the great essentials of religion and of Christianity were. And something like that, one fears, a similarly thorough examination of the American Army would have shown.

Now, if that, or some measure of it, is true, it means that we have not succeeded, to the extent that we thought we had succeeded, in getting into the minds of men the

simple, basic convictions, ideals and hopes of Christianity. And just so far, of course, as that has not been done—and the comparatively superficial way in which our civilization has been permeated with Christian principles illustrates it—just so far we have failed in our work of education, and just so far we have failed to meet the conditions of world leadership.

4. My fourth suggestion is this: It concerns particularly the Christian college, that it should not fail to meet *the challenge of the three greatest achievements of the war*. Those three greatest achievements of the war, it seems to me, were these: men's deepening conviction of the supremacy of the intangible values; co-operation in a great cause on an unheard-of scale; and the largest measure of the spirit of sacrifice the world has ever seen. Those achievements alone make the time of the war a time of glory. I have time only to remind you that they are great racial achievements, and great possible spiritual assets. And because they are such achievements and possible spiritual assets, they are a perpetual challenge to all men, and particularly to the Christian college.

They are something that no man, no fate, can take away from us. The human race did those things in this war and it is a thing forever and forever to thank God for that they were done. But we must make certain that we carry over these great achievements into the times and tasks of peace.

5. This calls for *the method of Christ*, and Christ's method is the method of the contagion of the good life. And that life, Christ said, must be absolutely sound. The salt must not have lost its savor. The light must not have gone out. The leaven must not be a spoiled leaven. The seed must not be a dead seed. One of the things, thus, which as college teachers we need above all to bring home to ourselves, is that there is no sound way of building the kingdom of God and a new civilization on the earth but by putting in one sound life after another—by the touch of life upon life. There is no other method so utterly free

from all pretense. And it will involve the basic conviction of Jesus of the priceless value of every human soul that underlies that essential and radical democracy for which Christianity really stands.

6. My last suggestion is this: We shall accomplish our destiny as Christian institutions in the proportion in which we recognize that *it is the business of Christianity to conquer the world*—not to run away from it, but to be in the world and yet not of the world; to learn how to use the world as not abusing it. We may be sure that we are coming to a time—the most perilous in the history of American colleges—when we may expect that abundance is to be ours. In that time we are still to prove to men that we can own our possessions and not be owned by them—not by flight from the riches of civilization, but by mastery of them as means. We are called to conquer the world—to know how to take all the power and the wealth and the knowledge and the beauty of the world, and bind it to the chariot of the on-coming and all-embracing purposes of God.

II. President Mary E. Woolley, Mount Holyoke College THE COLLEGE WOMAN IN THIS WORLD LEADERSHIP

World leadership is pre-eminently the subject for a gathering of college men and women at the opening of this significant year 1920. We hardly need to be reminded that the word is not used in a selfish sense; the only leadership which will meet the need of the day is a leadership interpreted in terms of service, a self giving, not a self seeking. That the college should furnish leaders is not a new statement; it has been iterated and reiterated in the past. The difference is that it no longer comes from the college as an assertion. Rather, it comes from without as a demand.

World leadership calls for the college woman as well as for the college man. Incredible as it may seem to us, that truth is not always realized. Attention has recently been drawn to Mr. Frick's will, so generous and so wise in

its recognition of this need as far as colleges for men are concerned, so oblivious of the fact that colleges for women exist. That is not an isolated example—there are still others who look upon the woman's college as useful only in preparing some women for a profession, without the faintest realization of what college training for women means and may mean in the development of civilization.

The writer of one of the pamphlets issued by the committee on "The War and the Religious Outlook" says that "The Great War has revealed the fact that one of the least considered and least used of the world's stores of power lies latent in the minds of women;" that "women are conscious as never before . . . that the world has actual need of their peculiar contribution to its thinking and achievement."

There is not time or need this evening to suggest the ways in which women responded to the call during the war. We are reminded that "Civilization had been built on the assumption that woman was physically inferior to man; yet with civilization falling about our ears it was discovered that woman's powers of endurance could be stretched to compass tasks demanding physical strength equal to that of man. The life of the centuries had brought about unequal mental development between men and women, but, as occasion demanded, women slipped easily and naturally into positions demanding acumen, initiative and resourcefulness. Governments had been built on the theory that not only their creation but their preservation depended upon the contribution of thought and life which men could give; the chief argument given by the opponents of woman suffrage was the argument that the vote could be given only as a reward to those who could defend the State in time of war. Yet within the past five years the women of England, France and the United States have been impressively told that the very existence of these nations depended upon the quality and extent of woman's effort. Perhaps future historians will find that the greatest discovery of the years of the war was the discovery of the potentialities of woman's service and woman's point of view."

The women at work now in these less conspicuous but equally critical days of reconstruction, in large proportion, are college women. It would be impossible to give anything like an adequate impression of what they are doing today as leaders in rebuilding shattered homes and lives. To take as an illustration simply the two colleges for women in the Connecticut Valley, Smith and Mount Holyoke. Every one heard of the Smith Unit during the war; probably not so many know how it has gone on into the times of peace, not only in France, where it has been doing follow-up work, adding to other forms of relief that of "psychiatric" social work among the soldiers suffering from shell shock, but also in the Near East. From Malatia Armenia a Smith woman writes: "Schools and hospitals are what the country most needs; 'education' is what even the Turks say is needed. . . . If more Smith girls can come to take our places, it can become a real college center."

Mount Holyoke College women are also among the leaders in the work of rebuilding this sorely smitten portion of the world. The brief records suggest very significant reading between the lines—"sailed in January, 1919, as a member of the relief expedition to Turkey;" "doing relief work with her husband in Jerusalem;" "has charge of an orphanage for boys in Marsovan;" "is doing relief work in Turkey;" "is head of an orphanage in Samsoun;" "sailed in June, 1919, to work on nursing staff of the American Women's Hospital Unit;" "went to Turkey in November, 1919, to do work under the Young Women's Christian Association;" "doing relief work in Jerusalem with husband;" "sailed with her husband in July, 1917, for Russia to do relief and reconstruction work among Armenian and Syrian refugees."

Women are co-operating today as never before and it is in some of the great co-operative movements that the capacity for world leadership is most distinctly shown. The Young Women's Christian Association has been called a Women's League of Nations, "the girls of the world, the women of tomorrow—entering into an intimate and under-

standing fellowship, an asset for tomorrow—which perhaps the statesmen are neglecting!” France, Italy, Russia, Belgium, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Roumania, Jerusalem, the Orient—all and more are represented in the work initiated and carried on already far beyond anything that was dreamed possible in pre-war days. And this work is mainly the work of college women—the president of the Association, the chairman of the War Work Council, the secretaries and other workers overseas as well as in this country, are almost if not quite, without exception, graduates of our colleges.

Few people have the faintest conception of the attention which educated women are giving to industrial questions, not only those of recreation, housing, education and social life of the workers, but also to the deeper underlying problems. The titles of publications give a hint of the extent to which trained women are devoting themselves to these questions of the common welfare. “Community Problems,” “Reconstruction Programs,” “The Industrial Awakening and the Young Women’s Christian Association,” “Legal Recognition of Industrial Women,” “The Outlook for Town and Country,” “Woman’s Work from Primitive Times to the Present,” are titles chosen at random, giving some conception of the way in which women are leading in the investigation of one of the most serious phases of this reconstruction era. Women have taken a long step forward in the last five years, in their progress from the *remedial* to the *preventive*. Their program antedates the war. “To study with all our hearts the social problems, the difficulties in the lives of working women, and the remedies which legislation or private endeavor might bring to them, should be our task,” was the burden of Miss Florence Simms’ report to the Fourth World’s Conference at Berlin in 1910. That realization has intensified and the great task has become “that of arousing in all women a sense of their own personal responsibility for existing social conditions and of the need for study—hard study—of the economic and sociological

problems with which the world is grappling. To educate public opinion on industrial problems is the other half of the task."

Nor is it generally recognized how fast women are forging ahead along the lines of public health and social morality. The International Conference of Women Physicians held in New York from September 15th to October 22d was a gathering of far-reaching significance. At the close of that conference the idea of a co-operative movement of national women's organizations took form as the Women's Foundation for Social Health, its purpose being to carry to the highest efficiency the social health work of the country, in an effort in which college women are largely in the majority.

A World Association of University Women is one of the ways in which college women are exerting their influence on the side of a new internationalism.

We have been told again and again that we are living in a new world. What kind of a new world? Women are intensely interested in that question and in its answer. Constance Maynard, the first principal of Westfield College of the University of London, in a recent article writes: "Men have chiefly to do with what *is*, and they must make the best of the material which lies before them; but women have chiefly to do with *what will be*, or rather (if we have eyes to see it) *what ought to be*. Our thoughts and aims lie a little beyond the blue horizon that encircles the present decade. . . . The lot that falls to us is nothing but endless hope that the future world will be better than the one we know."

Women have naturally much to give toward the making of the world that ought to be. They have first, sympathy with the constructive, building up rather than tearing down, a passion for helping to restore the devastated country, the wrecked home, the shattered life, the instinct which makes women everywhere, as one observer expresses it, in favor of a League of Nations.

Women have a keen sense of the personal, a charac-

teristic of greatest value in the industrial world needing a keener realization of the personal, the ability to think of "laborers," not so exclusively of "labor;" to visualize other lands as populated by human beings, not by "races."

Again, women are idealists, thinking of the world as it ought to be, rather than as it is.

Love of the constructive, devotion to the personal, idealism—fine qualities these, worthy of wise leadership. And it is to the college that we must look for help in developing that power of leadership, giving the "vision and understanding and trained mind" which are "the object of education," as it has been expressed. That is the real forte of the college. There is indeed "danger in chaotic, untutored, undirected thinking." To help shape the *thinking* of the new world along sane and just lines to righteous ends, that is the tremendous task set before the college for women as truly as before the college for men. Not material force, but the force of thought, is what must be called into play.

And to the development of the mind must be added the development of the spirit. The value of the spiritual in education must be recognized just as clearly as the value of the intellectual. It is a difficult way that stretches before the men and women of tomorrow, difficult in every department of life, industrial, political, social, community, national and international.

"Humanity has struck its tents and is again on the march," are the solemn words of General Smuts. Whither? The answer will depend upon the leaders. May God give us the power to send out from our colleges men—and women—of clear vision, of strong purpose, of high ideals, quick to see and ready to meet the need of the world.

III. President Henry Louis Smith, Washington and Lee University.

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE IN TRANSITION

For two hundred years the four-year college course of liberal arts has been at once the fortress and the foun-

tain of American culture. Yet within recent years the American college has found its place and special function endangered as never before in our history. The rapid development of our splendidly equipped professional schools is steadily encroaching upon the four-year college course from above, while the American public high school, with an aggressiveness matched only by its limitless resources, is absorbing the freshman and sophomore years from below.

The graduate school has now become the home of American scholarship, research and love of learning, while a babel of accusing voices is everywhere proclaiming and lamenting the idleness and restless frivolity of the average undergraduate, the steady decay of the ancient scholarly ideals, the multiplicity of campus activities which make old-fashioned hard study an impossibility, and a conflict of college ideals so hopeless that the maxima cum laude graduate of the faculty is often the scorn of the campus and the idol of the campus the dread of the faculty.

These critics are sincere, their laments are genuine, their charges weighty and specific. Yet amid this chorus of accusing voices from without and within three stubborn facts challenge attention and reassure the friends of the American college.

Our hard-hearted, cool-headed, far-sighted American business men are today pouring their treasured millions into these colleges at a rate never approached in the past. Our American parents are today entrusting to these maligned colleges more of their treasured sons and daughters than ever before. And somehow or other, in the orderly processes of peace and in the whirlwinds of war, the graduates of these modern colleges, like their predecessors of a more rigid and studious era, still outstrip their non-college competitors in the race for life's prizes.

The key to this apparently hopeless tangle of opinions, facts and theories is found, I think, in the fact that the American college is instinctively finding a new place and function. Against the despairing opposition of old-time college faculties, the overmastering Spirit of the Age, not

content with transforming our political and industrial institutions, is resistlessly shaping our historic four-year college course to meet the needs and answer the call of a new social and civic order. The present seething ferment is not the chemistry of decay, but the vigor of the new wine bursting its outgrown and inelastic bottle.

The bane of our present educational system is the professional pedagogue's belief that the chief end of man is study, and therefore the chief end of study is to prepare for further study. Acting on this theory the college has for generations chained and enslaved the high school, and is now in its turn chained and enslaved by the graduate school.

Already is the American high school, in closer contact with the needs of the people, bursting its bonds and justifying its new-found freedom by an incredibly enlarged service.

Now let the American College of Liberal Arts also break her chains and have the vision and courage to adopt a new ideal for her graduates and a new measuring rod for her processes. Her campus is no longer a mere training place for the learned professions; it is swarming with future American business men of every type and function. Our complex and strenuous age finds little use for the dyspeptic hermit of the midnight oil who was once the laureate of the campus. To build a graduate fitted for efficiency and leadership in modern life the American college must prepare and frankly adopt new plans and specifications.

The master word of the Middle Ages was "power;" its hero was the conqueror. The master word of the eighteenth century was "liberty;" its hero was the patriot. The master word of the nineteenth was "knowledge;" its hero was the scholar and inventor. The master word of the twentieth blends all three into a richer and nobler ideal. It is "citizenship," the keynote of a new era in which civic emphasis shall shift from human rights and privileges to human duties and responsibilities; when power and knowledge and the gains of research shall all be dedicated to the

common good; when fewer, perhaps, shall be called to die for their country, but many—nay, all—shall live for it; when love shall be the law of American life and service the measure of American greatness.

THE AIM OF THE COLLEGE OF TOMORROW

Amid toil and conflict and disorder, in clamor and friction and misunderstanding, our war-torn and tempest-shaken age is shaping itself to this new ideal of co-operative citizenship, and calling as never before for sane, broad-minded, far-sighted leadership.

As the religious world of today can neither understand nor utilize the holy hermits of the middle ages, so our age has outgrown the hermit scholars of fifty years ago who spent their lives in the pursuit of learning solely for the personal joy of its possession.

Let the American college of today turn over to the graduate school the pursuit of learning for its own sake, and teach the young citizens on her campus that knowledge is but a means to an end. Let her answer the call of the twentieth century and furnish as her typical graduate, not the scholar equipped for research and fired with a passion for further study, but the ideal Christian citizen, equipped for life and fired with a passion for service; trained not only to Know, which is Scholarship, and to Appreciate, which is Culture, but also to Be, which is Manhood, and to Do, which is Citizenship; of a trained mind no less virile and vigorous than of yore, but working through a body equally trained to vigor and virility; not only learned, but resourceful and energetic; able to manage himself and other men; with a passion for righteousness and a self-sacrificing devotion to the public welfare.

HER NEW CENTER OF GRAVITY

To manufacture this rare and complex product, the educational machinery of the college must revolve around a new center, adopt new methods, and work toward a new end. Let us recognize the moral sin and educational folly of our present idolatry—the blind worship of Alma Mater.

Her fair campus and stately buildings, her endowments and traditions and historic renown are but the means to a greater end. Let her greatness be measured not by the splendor of her lineage or of her material possessions, but solely by her present service to the individual student now on her campus. Around him let her whole organization, trustees, faculty and equipment, revolve. Let his training, development and inspiration be at once the aim and the measure of all her multiplied agencies and activities.

With her plans and processes adjusted to this new center, let the College of Tomorrow realize that Character alone makes Education a blessing, that the raw material entrusted to her molding hands is not the disembodied intellect alone to be trained to Study, but the whole man, social, moral, physical, intellectual, to be trained to Live and Work.

Let the ideal college teacher be first of all a Man, human, magnetic, high-minded, inspirational. Let the whole system of college honors and college discipline be remodeled to fit the new ideal of college training. Let the moral atmosphere of the campus, breathed hourly by every student, be rid of its contagious poison and made clean, warm and uplifting. With a cool head, a warm heart and an unconquerable zeal, let teachers and administrators broaden the circle of their official duties to include and utilize not only classrooms and laboratories, but dormitories, playgrounds and campus loafing places; not a student's attendance and papers only, but also his health, habits, character, recreations and social influence; not the specified requirements for a degree only, but the whirlpool of athletic and social activities which make or mar the personality of the individual student.

Such I conceive to be the new aim, such the ideal, such the mission and opportunity of the College of Tomorrow. The call of our bewildered and tumultuous age, seething with suspicion and revolt and reconstruction, is for wisdom rather than knowledge, character rather than book learning, personality rather than logic, love rather than power, citizenship rather than scholarship.

If the American college bends all her splendid energies to meet these demands, the glory of her past record will be eclipsed by her future service. Not only will she furnish to the graduate schools an undiminished output of scholars and investigators, but she will become infinitely more fruitful in the molding and making of men.

IV. General Leonard Wood, United States Army.

I think there is one thing we can look back to with very great pride and that is the work of the American colleges during the war. I had the good fortune to attend many of the American college commencements during the spring and early summer and it was a fine inspiration to meet the youngsters who had been overseas and who had come back. I went to Williams College only a month or two ago to meet the returning men and to be present at the presentation of war medals. Some 1,700 odd went from Williams; that is to say, students and graduates. I remember the remarkable figures concerning one class which graduated 103 men and sent 101 into war work or into the ranks. I think it was 1917.

Now, that tells what the university spirit stands for better than anything else could. We find this spirit of service, this spirit of sacrifice running through all our universities. It seems to me today that the general slogan in America should be "Steady." There is today much loose talk, loose writing and rather unsound thinking. There never has been a time in our national life when we should stand steady more than today, and hold on to the things which have made us what we are. We must stand for law and order, the rights of property, the rights of the individual, government under the constitution. We should avoid all class legislation and avoid drifting from these moorings which we know are trustworthy.

We find all over this country a great deal of uneasiness just now, a condition of instability. There is really nothing alarmingly wrong. Ninety-five per cent of labor wants to

run straight, but some of it is running under bad alien leadership. Almost without exception the bad leadership is alien. We find a very fair and very quick response from labor whenever it is met halfway. I found at Gary, for instance, that labor was not difficult to handle, the moment it was dealt with fairly and squarely and with the firmness of justice. We found in the coal fields of West Virginia a similar disposition to meet a fair appeal. We found the same in the recent mine difficulties in Kansas. I think what we need today in this country is to wake up to our responsibility with reference to labor.

The danger within our house is not the red so much as it is our own indifference. We must strive to put leadership into the hands of real Americans. We can not lay too much stress on this. The Red element in this country is comparatively small, but it is well organized and active. I think while we have been occupied with the war this element has gained headway. The time has come now to stiffen up and insist upon the observations of law and order, respect for the rights of property and the authorities. We can do this and do it very easily, and without any great degree of harshness. For the element that is causing trouble in the country is a cowardly element; the I. W. W. and the Reds are in basic principles much the same; they are lawless and often assassins, enemies of government.

We must preach Americanization more than we have ever done before and do all we can to help it on.

There isn't really any ugly spirit in the country, it is simply a spirit of unrest, a spirit of desire for change, and it seems to me now is not a time for change. We want to stop rocking the boat and get down to conditions of normal stability. The slogan should be law and order, the rights of property, no autocracy of labor and no autocracy of wealth, but a real democracy of both; that we should strive to build up and maintain outside the ranks the same democracy that we had in the ranks during the war, where rich and poor stood shoulder to shoulder, animated by a common purpose, and that their country's welfare. I think

we must have a little bit more of this in the ranks of the great industrial struggle. Wherever you reach out your hand and try to help, wherever you inject the human element you will find a ready response.

As soon as the war is over, it is probable that there will be a flood of immigration coming into this country. Our labor has a right to protection against the horde which may come here as soon as peace is officially declared, swamping us with people who understand nothing of our institutions, who come here with an idea that liberty means license, and who do not bring past traditions of their own which are desirable. We must see to it that only the right kind comes. In other words, we must look into the quality of our immigration as we never have before. The flood of immigration will come largely from the war-swept areas of southeastern Europe. It may be composed largely of people who have never lived under representative government, who have been a part of the great forces of disorganization and destruction which have swept over Europe—people who have no sympathy with our institutions or ideals.

We do not want and we must not permit this class of people to come to us. We have put about all the sand in our cement that it will stand. We need a certain amount of immigration for development of our agriculture, our business and our industries, and we welcome the man or woman who comes here for the purpose of adopting our ideals, supporting our institutions, living up to our standards. But we must turn our faces like flint against those who came here declaredly opposed to our form of government, and imbued with ideas and theories of government or lack of government, which are deadly.

We should look into the quality of our immigration before it comes on board ship for America. We should be as careful as we are in the issuing of passports to those who are coming to our country in time of war.

We have in this country at the present time a large and highly organized force of disorder—the so-called Reds.

They are dangerous in part because of their organization and activity, but especially because of our own indifference. These people are systematically trying to create discontent and a feeling of opposition to our government, and they are openly declaring their determination to substitute for ordered government the kind of chaos which rules in soviet Russia and other countries.

Now, good immigration is highly desirable. But all of it which comes to us must receive more attention after its arrival than heretofore. Generally speaking, the immigrant lands in New York or some other large port and is turned loose as soon as he passes the gang-plank. From the moment of landing, he is fed on the literature of the Red. He is loaded up with hostile propaganda. He is exploited, commercialized and allowed to drift into racial areas to live in racial groups, and he is fed on a dialect press.

If these people are fit to come among us, to become a part of us, they are worth looking after and caring for.

I believe that on arrival arrangements should be made to hold them for a time under observation and subject to an intensive course of Americanization. They should be told what our government stands for, the conditions under which they are going to live. They should have an idea of the machinery of our government. And we should do all that is possible to urge them to go to sections of the country where their previous training will be of the greatest use to us and of the greatest value to them. And, not only should we advise them to go, but we should aid them in going. Tens of thousands of highly trained European farmers are congregated in our great cities as hucksters and venders—producing little or nothing—and they would be simply invaluable in our western and southern farming regions. There they would become quickly Americanized, by contact, and they would be absorbed into the bulk of our population and disappear.

As for the Reds who are aliens, we should deport them after due process of law. By this I mean—after proper judicial procedure.

The American Red must be handled through our own courts.

We should not hold one door open for the deportation of the Red and leave the other open for the admission of the unexamined and unquestioned immigrant. We must remember that the children of these people are to marry among our own and that we not only have the right but we are under a solemn obligation to see to it that the best interests of our own people are protected.

At present, the Americanization of the alien is far from what we would have it. We must take hold of this problem systematically and thoroughly. It isn't one to be trifled with or neglected.

It is not the time now to give up the big organizations which did such good work during the war. There is quite enough work to do at home. We have been putting out the fire in the other man's home and it is time now to see what is causing the smoke in our own. I think the work of the big organizations like the Young Men's Christian Association, the Y. W., Red Cross, the Knights of Columbus, the Jewish Welfare and Salvation Army, and others, should continue. They all did good work in the war. We saw a great deal of it here. I think we ought to try and get them interested in that part of our population which really needs help. We ought to get them to work in the slums of the cities with the same vigor that they went to work in the camps.

The women of America did a wonderful work in sending our men overseas sound of body and clean in soul, filled with the spirit of sacrifice, and they can do no better today than to attack with the same spirit these alien elements in our population in a campaign of Americanization. I believe that a year of propaganda of that kind would do much to quiet the unrest.

Then there is another important question, the treatment of the men who come home. We must give our best efforts to seeing to it that all those who have been overseas and in the training camps are given every opportunity,

not only to get back to their old positions, but to secure better ones.

I feel very strongly that we ought to teach a great deal more of economics in our universities than we do. You will find, in talking with people all over the country, very loose ideas on the subject. They seem to think you can legislate harmony into the relations between capital and labor. You hear a great many addresses about bringing about improved conditions, which are purely theoretical and idealistic. There isn't much to them.

I think we have got to get back to basic principles and teach sound principles to the people that no man can be paid more than he earns; and that an honest day's work must be given for a day's good pay. This we must drive home. I think we must impress upon all workers that we can not reduce the high cost of living except through increased production and increased efficiency.

I think we ought to urge simple economic teaching in every university and college in the country, and I believe we should have a much more thorough teaching in economics in our upper schools. It is one of the subjects that the people are least well informed upon.

We could not hold an army together for any length of time and have it really subordinate unless we looked after the health of the men and saw how they were clothed and housed and fed and doctored; in other words, unless we showed a more human interest in it. You must look after the human element with labor and give it reasonable hours of work and recreation, and while we do that I think we have got to embrace the old fundamental principle that rights of property are sacred, whether it is acquired by the rich or poor and that we must give an honest day's work for an honest wage.

We must preach the doctrine of Abraham Lincoln, when he was speaking of labor in his time. You remember what he said, "Let not he who is houseless tear down the house of his neighbor, but rather let him strive industriously to build one for himself, thus showing by example

confidence that his own when built shall stand." This is sound doctrine and we should emphasize it today. Impress upon people that they can not have something for nothing. You find in places an idea that a man can take that which belongs to others but, with it all, there is no dangerous spirit, it is an ignorant spirit. Labor needs the best American leadership in all fields, and I believe we should strive to give it to them.

We find in all these men who come back from overseas a condition of increased efficiency. I asked the representative of a big firm which employs 17,000 men and women how he found the men returning from service. He said the men were more efficient from their military training, they were steadier and "I can assure you they have all come home hating war."

So those of you in whose establishments there are men who have had military training need not fear for a moment that they have anything of a military spirit. They have all brought home very sound ideas as to the necessity for some system of national preparedness and they are willing, so soon as the war weariness is gone, to back up any reasonable proposition.

And I find everywhere they are against a large army. They believe in a small, efficient army and a good navy, and they have seen enough of the world to realize that we need a good merchant marine. They are much wiser men that they were when they went abroad, much more conservative. I don't think there has been a finer exhibition of character in this country than that which was shown by the American Legion on the western coast when a lot of their number had been shot down. They locked up the men who had done the shooting and then guarded the jail against the mob. It is worth something when you have men that will do that. That is the spirit they have brought back from abroad and I think it has taught us that we can give a reasonable degree of military training without any danger of becoming militarists in any way.

Our new military establishment must be a distinctly

American one, without any trace of Prussianism or extreme militarism and I think the tendency is in that direction. I believe this American Legion is going to be one of the greatest forces for good in the country.

One other subject that impresses me wherever I go, and this department runs from Utah on the west to Pennsylvania on the east and Canada on the north to Arkansas on the south, is that you have a great variety of industries, a great variety of schools, and I find everywhere a growing impression that the professor and teacher ought to be paid very much more than they are getting.

Our teachers in colleges and schools are underpaid from one end of the country to the other. This teaching force in our universities and schools is doing a work second in importance to none that is being done in this country. Our country rests largely upon its public school system. We want to keep it up to the highest possible level of efficiency. These men and women who today are teaching the youth of this country, the children of our land, are forming the characters of the men and women of tomorrow. As they are taught today so will they be thinking and acting tomorrow. It is a most dangerous situation to fail to give proper attention to the school system. Our teaching force is fighting that silent battle against ignorance and prejudice, upon the outcome of which depends in no small measure the stability of this republic. They know they are underpaid, and we know it. They are unhappy and discontented, and a great many of the best men and women in the teaching force are leaving. They are going into other lines of endeavor. They feel they have a right to make the best use of their talents and to find a position where they can earn a reasonable return for their labor, where they can afford to have a little bit of pleasure, to marry, to raise a family and to give their children a reasonable opportunity.

Professors in our great universities today are receiving, many of them, salaries below that of the average skilled workman, and they feel it, and the result is there is a feel-

ing that the teaching profession is not understood. We want to change that feeling. We want to use our teachers well, whether they be men or women, remembering that they are making the men and women of tomorrow.

We want in this country for our teaching force men and women of the very best intelligence, and of the highest character. Many of the very best are staying, it is true, because they have the missionary spirit, because of love of the work. The teaching force of America is making the citizens of tomorrow, and it is a most important duty. Pay them well and treat them well.

We talk of other things, and of many progressive ideas, and so forth, but one of the big practical things is to see to it that the teaching force of America is given the recognition which it is entitled to, because you can not trifle with the education and training of your children. As your children are trained and educated, so will the Ship of State be tomorrow. The security of our Republic rests largely on the educational system of the states.

We want to put into our high schools a great deal more of sound economic training than we have hitherto. We ought to give at least the fundamentals of economic training in the lower schools, and in the high schools it ought to be gone into pretty thoroughly. That an honest day's wage means an honest day's work; that the real remedy for the high cost of living is increased production; that the real enemies of labor are those who talk reduced production. We want to drive some of those ideas home. When our children go out from the schools and colleges they want to have more than a mere superficial knowledge of many things, so let us teach a little more of these basic, homely principles, and let us try to drive home, too, something more in the way of information as to what our Government stands for, how it is run, how it is operated, what the Constitution means, what is meant by the Constitutional guarantee.

We want to impress upon all our children that the Constitution is vital to our national life, and that every step

we have taken away from it has been a step toward chaos.

We must strive to have friendly relations with all nations, and entangling alliances with none. We must preserve our freedom of action, our freedom to respond to the only mandate which we, as a free people, can recognize—the mandate which comes from the American conscience; American public opinion.

I think the country has improved decidedly in character and quality from the war. I believe the people are better for it. I believe that out of the sacrifices and the suffering and the effort has come a better spirit, and I am not in the least alarmed about these local conditions of groups of Reds here and there. They are absolutely insignificant where the authorities are not timid or inefficient. The red flag never flies in this country except in districts where you have either cowardly or inefficient officials. It is not very dangerous now, but it is important to build up a strong public sentiment against it and do all we can to put it down.

The university man is going to be, as he always has been, one of the big factors for good, and I hope the universities will take up with a little more interest than heretofore the question of universal training for national service. You know, I am rather keen on this, but it is not because I am fond of war, it is because I saw the unnecessary losses of this war. I do not believe in training under arms in the university. I think there is a good deal of waste time there, but I think if we could give, in your universities, those technical and theoretical courses which would be very useful in making officers and by limiting the training under arms to summer camps we would get far better results than we have had before. I think that is the way we should deal with it.

It may interest you to know that in dealing with these conditions of unrest, we have found in each and every town—in Omaha, where they hanged the mayor and raised Cain generally, and in Gary, where they tried to create serious disturbances—that right from the ranks of the strikers, the

organized strikers, came men in uniform who volunteered their services in maintaining law and order. That spirit is worth something. And I think you are going to find it all through the country, these fellows who have been in the training camp and overseas are going to be one of the strong forces for order.

There is another thing that we ought to push forward: When we had our men in training this year, we found 50 per cent of the men of military age were unfit for military service because of physical deficiency. The sad part of it was that at least half of those men had visible defects that could have been corrected by training in schools and colleges.

Another thing is very important. You should teach more Spanish in your institutions. I have had a good many years in Spanish countries, five years in the Philippines and four in Cuba, and it was almost impossible to get men from our universities who can speak or write Spanish. We are going to have a tremendous development of commerce in South America and it seems to me that we ought to take that up seriously. Spanish is one of the great languages for the young American.

Gentlemen, this is a rather tedious talk and I have spoken very informally with an idea of bringing up a few of the things I have noticed in going over the country; the need of concentrated effort on the part of the people to help the other half; the building up of a strong spirit of Americanism, helpful and generous and intensely American, and a very careful supervision of our immigration and a much more careful handling of it after it gets here; these seem to me to be things which demand serious attention.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL RELATIONS**I. Robert L. Kelly, the Association of American Colleges**

It is not necessary, I am sure, for me to undertake to interpret the purpose of the Association's international scholarship plan. You are very familiar, not only with its origin and its purpose, but also, in general terms, with its progress. It is because of this familiarity and of your splendid spirit of co-operation that the plan has developed so successfully during the past two years.

I may only say that the plan originated at the annual meeting of the Association in 1918. At that time the Committee on War Problems, of which President Powell was chairman, presented a series of recommendations of which item No. 4 provided for "the multiplication of American fellowships and scholarships for students, both men and women, from our allies." This is the charter of the Association's international scholarship plan.

Shortly after the adoption of this resolution the Executive Committee of the Association formulated a plan to offer one hundred scholarships to French girls, as a part of this plan for American fellowships and scholarships. The plan was later approved by the United States Bureau of Education and negotiations were opened with the French government, at the request of the Association, by United States Commissioner Claxton.

About the first of April of that year the Emergency Council on Education was organized, elected its officers, formally approved the plan of the Association and incorporated it as a part of its general program, designating the Association as the agency through which the work was to be done.

The work in connection with the plan was carried on from the Chicago office of the Association until about the first of July, when the Association's office was transferred temporarily to the office of the Emergency Council on Education, which about that time became the American Council on Education. President Cowling, as you remember,

was the president for that year, both of the Association and of the American Council, and from July until December the work was carried on jointly by the Association of American Colleges and the American Council on Education, the Executive Secretary of the Association becoming also the Executive Secretary of the Council. When the war emergency was over and the office of the Association was brought back to Chicago, all the scholarship work was brought along.

The Association office, soon after the annual meeting, asked the colleges and universities of the country, without regard to whether they were Association members, if they would indicate their willingness to co-operate. Two hundred and thirty scholarships were offered in response to our invitation and later two hundred and fifty French girls applied for the scholarships.

A committee was sent to France by the Association, of which Dean Mary L. Benton of Carleton College was the chairman; and this committee worked in co-operation with the French Department of Education in the selection of the scholars. One hundred and thirty-five were selected by competitive processes and of that number one hundred and fourteen actually arrived in the United States.

As a further development of the plan announced at the annual meeting of the Association, the American Council on Education, during the five months' period of which I speak, offered twenty scholarships to disabled French soldiers and those soldiers came to America; not only the twenty, but finally thirty-eight soldiers came to America for the academic year 1918-19.

The administration of that work also was put in the hands of the Association of American Colleges when the office of the Association was transferred to Chicago in December.

Now, most of you are familiar with the details which I have just been giving. You are not familiar with the facts, however, which I wish to give now, somewhat in the nature of a report on our first group of girls.

Of the one hundred and fourteen French girls who were placed in American institutions the last academic year five were classified as freshmen, twenty as sophomores, forty-eight as juniors, fourteen as seniors, thirteen as graduate students and twenty-two as special students.

In June, 1919, twelve received the B. A. degree and three the degree of Master of Arts. About thirty-five of our first group returned to France for the summer, of whom sixteen re-entered American colleges in the fall. About twenty-five were placed in summer camps and a few were placed in private families for the summer, while others spent the summer in travel. The number of 1918 scholarship girls now in America, therefore, is ninety-five, and of these, fourteen are teaching in American schools, part of this number carrying on their studies also in graduate universities.

Among the institutions which have received our last year's girls for graduate study are Ohio State University, Northwestern University, the University of Chicago, the Catholic University of Washington, the University of Illinois, the University of Texas, Cornell University and the University of Wisconsin.

So much for our first group of girls. At the last meeting of the Association the work which had been done up to that time was approved and the officers of the Association were encouraged to develop the plan still further if possible. Some effort was made to secure scholarships for representatives of other nations than France and a few institutions responded favorably to that effort. In view of the fact, however, that we did not have a committee on selection in any other country except France and in view of other difficulties which I do not now need to detail, we did not succeed in bringing students from any country except France. In September, 1919, eighty-seven girls arrived under the auspices of the Association and, with those now here from the year before, we have today in the United States under our auspices one hundred and eighty-two French girls.

There were also brought to the colleges of the United States this fall under the auspices of the Association about twenty young men and they are pursuing their studies in various institutions of learning.

I submit a list of institutions which have been approved by the Association and in which French students have been placed during the two academic years which this report covers. In this list are sixteen tax-supported colleges and universities, forty-five independent and denominational colleges and universities, twenty women's colleges, and ten Catholic institutions.

California: Mills College, Pomona College.

Colorado: Colorado College.

Connecticut: Yale University.

District of Columbia: Trinity College.

Illinois: Illinois College, Illinois Wesleyan University, Illinois Woman's College, James Millikin University, Kindergarten Institute, Knox College, Northwestern University, University of Chicago, University of Illinois.

Indiana: Butler College, Earlham College, DePauw University, St. Mary's of Notre Dame, St. Mary's of the Woods.

Iowa: Coe College, Cornell College, Grinnell College, Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, State University of Iowa.

Kansas: Baker University, Washburn College.

Kentucky: Georgetown College.

Maryland: Goucher College.

Massachusetts: Boston University, Mount Holyoke College, Radcliffe College, Simmons College, Smith College, Tufts College, Wellesley College, Wheaton College, Williams College.

Michigan: Albion College, Alma College, Kalamazoo College, University of Michigan.

Minnesota: Carleton College, College of St. Teresa, Hamline University, Macalester College, College of St. Catherine, University of Minnesota.

- Missouri: Drury College.
New Hampshire: Dartmouth.
New Jersey: College of St. Elizabeth.
New York: College of New Rochelle, College of Mt. St. Vincent, Cornell University, Elmira College, Hamilton College, Syracuse University, Wells College.
North Dakota: University of North Dakota.
Ohio: College of Wooster, Kenyon College, Lake Erie College, Miami University, Municipal University of Akron, Oberlin College, Ohio State University, Ohio Wesleyan University, University of Cincinnati, Western Reserve University.
Pennsylvania: Allegheny College, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Dickinson College, Haverford College, Margaret Morrison Carnegie School, Pennsylvania State College, Swarthmore College, Villa Nova, Wilson College.
Rhode Island: Woman's College of Brown University.
South Dakota: University of South Dakota.
Texas: State College for Women.
Virginia: Sweet Briar College.
Washington: State College of Washington, Whitman College.
West Virginia: University of West Virginia.
Wisconsin: Beloit College, Lawrence College, Milwaukee-Downer College, Ripon College, University of Wisconsin.

You may be interested to know also that the ages of the girls, both for the first and second year, ranged from sixteen and a half to twenty-eight years, the average being twenty-one plus.

So much for a very simple statement of the actual development of our plan up to the present time.

Now, we are very much gratified to present the other side of this question. Really, very much to our astonishment, in view of conditions in France made inevitable by the war, the French government began the process of offering scholarships to American students in the summer of

1919. A communication was addressed by Monsieur Petit du Taillis to Dr. Cowling, as chairman of the American Council on Education, calling his attention to the fact that two scholarships were available for American girls in the normal school at Sevres. These were advanced scholarships. He also advised that the French government stood ready, if it was approved by American educators, to offer a number of scholarships to American girls in French Lycées and he said that the normal school at St. Germain would also probably offer scholarships.

In conformity with this offer, two scholars were immediately selected in the United States for the first normal school named, and Dr. Cowling replied to Monsieur Petit Du Taillis that, as in the past, the administration of the work would be carried on by the Association of American Colleges. Later Monsieur Petit Du Taillis formally announced to the Association six scholarships, each for three years in the normal school at St. Germain and gave the privilege of appointing two this year, with the understanding that two each might be appointed in 1920 and in 1921. As soon as that information came to the Association the announcement was made to our various state directors.

In a short time thereafter the announcement came from Monsieur Petit Du Taillis that twenty scholarships in French Lycées were offered for the year 1919-1920. The Lycées were Victor Duruy, St. Germain, Versailles, Caen and Tours. Monsieur Petit Du Taillis also gave the information that when Miss Benton arrived from France, she would give further details.

When she came an Association letter was sent to the Superintendent of Public Instruction in every state in the Union, indicating the fact that we had these scholarships at our disposal. We took this method of publicity in addition to the method which had already been adopted of sending the information to the state directors of the Association from the fact that the French authorities expressed preference for girls from eighteen to twenty years of age for the Lycée scholarships. These

offers came during the summer vacation and there was little opportunity for wide publicity. The circumstances were such that it was impossible to see personally all of the applicants as had been done in the selection of the French scholars and therefore we succeeded in recommending for appointment to the Lycées only seventeen out of the twenty. All of these were seen either by Miss Benton, Lieutenant Galland of the French High Commission, or myself, with the exception of two, who were selected at my request by Mrs. Chase, the wife of Professor Chase of Hamilton College. The names, states and French schools of the American girls follow:

Normal Schools

St. Germain en Laye—

Helen GarrettCalifornia

Katherine M. TurcottOhio

Sevres—

Rosemary CarrIllinois

Helen B. SmithWisconsin

Lycées

Caen—

Evelyn M. ShipmanIndiana

Mary R. NewtonNew York

Helen TottyNew Jersey

St. Germain—

Eugenie VoinotDistrict of Columbia

Dorothy MahewNew York

Tours—

Frances E. WineIllinois

Edith SeveranceNew York

Emily GreenConnecticut

Versailles—

Elizabeth M. TuttleConnecticut

Margaret R. SherwoodConnecticut

Marion MartinNew York

Victor Duruy—

Ruth A. BrownMichigan

Kathryn A. QuiggIndiana

Sylvia SaundersNew York

We get splendid reports from these American girls in France. They are appreciating their opportunity. They certainly have entered into the spirit of this scholarship plan and I wish on behalf of the agencies which have had to do with this enterprise, on behalf of the colleges which have received the French girls and on behalf of the girls who are now in France, to thank Mr. Champenois and the interests he represents for the splendid way in which they have cooperated with us in this plan.

One day not very long ago I received two letters on scholarship matters in the same mail. One of those letters was from one of our American girls in the Lycée of Caen. It was full of expressions of appreciation of the splendid opportunities they were having in that Lycée. She said that she was proud that she and her colleagues had been selected for the best Lycée in France; that the community there served the purpose which they had in mind, in their judgment, better than any other community could possibly do; that the authorities of that Lycée and the people round about were very cordial and were showering kindnesses upon them. She went on to say that she believed the purest French was spoken in that community of any in France; that on every Thursday and every Sunday they were invited into the homes of the French people, although they never accepted an invitation until they first received the permission of the directress because the authorities of the Lycée were very anxious that they should not go into any homes except those where the purest of French was spoken.

The other letter was from a dean of women of a well known American college. She told how splendidly the French girls were getting along in that institution and then closed her letter by saying, "The only fear we have is that the English of these French girls may be corrupted as a result of their stay in America."

Now, this gives us a suggestion, at least, of what our task is and I believe that this incident and others like it will serve in some degree to make us appreciate

the responsibility which we have voluntarily taken in entering upon this modest plan of attempting to cement together the young manhood and womanhood of our two great Republics.

Following is a letter received from one of the students in France since the meeting of the Association:

Lycee de Jeunes Filles
Caen, Calvadas, France.
January 9, 1920.

My Dear Dr. Kelly:

I cannot tell you how wonderfully we were received in Paris at Christmas. First, we were guests of the National Catholic War Council of the United States and fifteen of us stayed together at their hotel. Mrs. Cavanaugh was our chaperon.

We went to Paris Wednesday, December 24th, and that same evening were taken to the theatre by Monsieur Petit-Dutaillis and his family. Christmas Day we went to dinner at the home of Monsieur Lucien Poincare, who is Recteur of the Sorbonne and brother to the President of France. After dinner we were conducted through the Sorbonne where we saw beautiful paintings and the Sorbonne Chapel. When we went back we were presented to Madame R. Poincare, the wife of the President, who stayed for tea. Others present were Monsieur and Madame Lansou, Monsieur and Madame Petit-Dutaillis, Monsieur and Madame Roz and other noted people. We felt highly honored.

That evening we had Christmas dinner with Mrs. Cavanaugh after which we were permitted to assist the War Council with their Christmas dance for American soldiers. No Christmas Day could ever have been more wonderful than this one for me.

Saturday we had a tea and Sunday we were received at the home of Monsieur Petit-Dutaillis by the Association of French Universities. Monday a French lady took us to visit many interesting churches and monuments, Tuesday we had another thé dansant, and Wednesday we went to tea at the home of Monsieur Firmin Roz. He has two charming daughters who entertained us with excellent music, and we met more interesting people. Wednesday night we were invited to a dance given by the American University Union. Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday we were guests at other teas.

The people were all very, very cordial. We met France at its best and realized what an opportunity and experience we were having. We received many compliments on our French and felt very proud of ourselves to be able to carry on conversations with those who are recognized as the most prominent people in France.

Between all our teas we tried to get in some sight-seeing and we succeeded in seeing the most interesting churches, museums, and monuments. We could only get a hasty glance in two hours spent at the Louvre, but we hope to make a more complete visit at Easter vacation, which will be fifteen days. Since the N. C. W. C. will be gone then we are going to try to get rooms with the Y. W. C. A. I hope we succeed.

Another interesting thing, the Red Cross is giving us medical attention free of charge and we certainly appreciate it.

Altogether we feel we are having a wonderful experience and

will appreciate it more and more as the years go by. A person could travel in France years and perhaps not see it and understand it as we girls who are placed in its everyday life.

Very sincerely yours,

Evelyn Shipman.

II. Charles D. Hurrey, The Committee on Friendly Relations.

We have to be revising our figures constantly with reference to the number and distribution of the students from other lands in the United States. It is perfectly conservative to say that the number is now ten thousand and if we were to count the people in the secondary schools it would go above that figure.

These students are found in all types of institutions but recent investigation reveals a fact of special interest to you of this association, that the majority still continue to go to the large universities where they can pursue what are called technical courses. It would not be difficult at all for many of our smaller colleges in this country to attract as many of these students as they could take care of if they would put in some courses of business administration and courses of engineering or agriculture. Most of the students who come from the Latin-American countries come for some kind of engineering or agricultural work.

After all, it will be in the institutions devoted to literature and liberal arts that the student from abroad will receive more personal attention and get a more adequate appreciation of the American spirit and America's desires and aspirations.

I have been interested to study, also, the record of a number of these students as to their lines of specialization, what they are out for and what they are contributing upon their return to their country. We find extreme specialization. I was visiting one of our large institutions in the east and calling upon a Filipino student. He said, "I am studying to find out how we can kill the germ that is killing the water buffaloes of the Philippine Islands." I was in John Hopkins University not

long ago and finding a Japanese student he said, "My specialty is the diseases of the silk worm." He said, "A great many of them were ill in the part of the world where I came from and it was an essentially economic question with me to study that matter." So we might mention others. I refer to one particular act of great heroism on the part of a woman student from Russia. She is the only woman student in a large university in the east, in a class of over 50 men, students in railroad engineering. She is a girl of noble birth. But suppose we had an American girl studying in Petrograd with a large group of men students and we can appreciate her feelings at times if we think of it in that light.

The achievements of these students, as you can testify probably better than I, have been very remarkable. I visited a British East Indian student who captured his Phi Beta Kappa in two years of work.

A few days ago I met a friend, a graduate of the University of Michigan, now a professor in Southern California. He captured the Northern Oratorical League contest a few years ago.

When our young men will win the oratorical contest of Japan, speaking in Japanese, then we can begin to throw stones at Japanese mentality. So we find a record in every phase of our college life.

I have been particularly pleased to notice the development among Chinese students in the study of music; among others in oratory and some in athletics.

The purpose of this committee which I have the pleasure of representing is to interpret to these people from abroad the best ideals of our American life. We are seeking to place in their hands accurate information about our institutions, trying to answer the questions of the young men or women from abroad who are looking to America for study. Moreover, we are organized so we can meet these young people upon arrival in the United States.

I am very sorry that due to certain technicalities in government relationship, we have not been as successful

as we might have been during these war days in meeting all of these students. I remember two men from the Indian Empire coming in and saying to me the other day, "We have just escaped from a detention of one month in an immigrant station in this country." Now, that doesn't make them feel very good. The possibility of that is being minimized and I think we will be able to see that every student who comes here receives a cordial welcome and is introduced as he ought to be.

As you know, we send telegrams to any agency that is disposed to be helpful to these people. So that when Mr. A leaves New York City for his institution out in the middle west somebody will be at the station in that little town to meet him when he arrives, to introduce him to members of the faculty and the student body.

May I make this appeal to you who are presidents of institutions: The student from abroad wants to know you. I am sorry that you oftentimes are so busy that you do not have time for the long interview with the Oriental that perhaps he might appreciate. But I do hope that your home and your office will not only be open to all the American students but particularly open to the lonely, sometimes inconspicuous student from abroad who, among his own people, may even today stand as a leader and, in the future, be even a greater leader.

We have found, in dealing with these students, a growing necessity of following them with reference to our American home life. We are trying to open American homes for little informal gatherings, particularly for a little group that can meet with other students and thus form friendships which will be most helpful. I have been pleased to see such institutions as the Rotary Club and the Chamber of Commerce take up this work. I attended a meeting where the Chamber of Commerce invited as their guests at luncheon all of the foreign students located in the city. They had this body of 37 students stand before the business men of the commun-

ity and the business men said afterwards, "This gives us a world outlook that we could not get in any other way. We appreciate this very much and will wish to repeat this event as a regular thing in our yearly program. We have found also a disposition to help these people during their vacation period. I met a Japanese the other day who said, "Probably the most immediate question before us today in the field of industry is such reformation as will stabilize our industrial situation. Thus," he said, "I am here, along with others from Japan, to study what America is doing along the line of service to people who are working in the factories."

We find also that by rendering them opportunities for employment, we are rendering them a great service. If you have some opportunity for them to earn money to complete their education I hope you will let us know.

The Committee on Friendly Relations has helped these students during the past few years with reference to expressions of their own views. You know, sometimes governments are afraid that these students will learn something in our country that is bad for their own countries.

Here is a paper called the Indian Christian Student. The Chinese publish two papers, The Chinese Monthly and Christian China. The Japanese are editing one called the Japan Review. These are edited and promoted by the people of these different countries themselves. We have one in Spanish for the Latin American students. These papers, I believe, should find place in your library and come to the attention of your students.

Now, may I say a word or two with reference to the contributions these students will bring to the people in our community. They certainly will have a tendency to stimulate the study of geography. When we find that a student comes from Trinidad, we are certainly going to look up where Trinidad is and when we are embarrassed by asking them some foolish question, we are pretty apt to find out the customs of that particular place.

I think it will teach us more about political science and international history and international law than we have ever learned before. I have been astonished, as you have, time and again to find the development of mind of these students in discussing world affairs. You can see how very difficult it is, of course, to keep perfect harmony among Chinese and Japanese and Koreans in this rather difficult period.

They will teach us the patience, the industry, of the man of Chinese character who used to study and study and study trying to pass examinations that were impossible, leaving an inheritance of devotion to their books that we cannot find elsewhere. There is a little grave in Rutgers College where a Japanese martyr lies who laid down his life to overwork. They will teach us a degree of heroism that I sometimes feel our American students may not exemplify; you will meet from time to time Armenian students—; the other day I met three of them. One of them said, "This is the first letter from home I have had in three years. My father was killed early in the war. My mother and sister were outraged. Think what I have gone through." A man from Poland said to me, "It was very hard for me to sell fruit on one of the streets of a college town here in America but I am determined not to accept financial assistance from anybody." He is making overwhelmingly good.

Then may I say, finally, these considerations certainly must make us feel in this country very happy and proud in having an opportunity to serve all nations through the people who, literally, in ten or fifteen years will be leaders in those nations.

May I recommend and urge that you have prepared during the coming years the record of the graduates from other lands who have gone out of your institutions. It will help you and will be of great interest generally throughout the world.

We have not yet overcome our provincial nature. I find even among professors sometimes, as well as the students, a disposition to speak out their prejudices. Now,

to illustrate that in relation to Japan, we may continue to have a prejudice toward Japan but what is the American college for if it is not to help the struggling Japanese who wants to see his country advance along democratic lines.

And so with other nationalities. It will help us to overcome our prejudices. We should judge people not by the color of their skins but by the quality of their souls.

We should have a spirit of true humility. Most of these students from other lands comment on our boastfulness.

I think we should have the spirit of cooperation rather than condescension. It is perfectly natural for any man of any race or nation, I suppose, to be prouder of his own people and land than he is of any other, and, therefore, to be condescending. Do you notice how many American people talk with about twice the pressure when talking to a foreigner? He isn't deaf, he is perfectly normal, but that is just the way we do. If we will get along-side of them in a spirit of genuine cooperation I think we will get further in these days of international brotherhood and then finally, if we will share with them the best things we have,—there isn't anything too good for a man who has overcome all kinds of obstacles to come here for further study. In the days to come such service will mean a world brotherhood.

May I say that we are at your service at any time and, particularly, if you have any inducement, or anything special to offer with reference to students from other lands, will you kindly let us know.

Dr. Shanklin suggests that I tell you our address. It is 347 Madison Avenue, New York, and our service is to all people, irrespective of race, color, or religion.

III. Frank Aydelotte, the Rhodes Scholarship Trust.

Whatever one may think of Thomas Carlyle,—and I personally think that he saw more accurately than any man in the 19th century, the disastrous things that were going to happen in the 20th, as a result of the materialis-

tic philosophy against which so much of his writing is directed—whatever one may think of his ideas, I think everyone must admire that passage in which he compares civilization to the Phoenix, periodically building its own funeral pyre, and periodically arising new-born from its ashes. He carries it out in a very interesting way. Carlyle says the conflagration does not take place entirely and completely before the new bird is born, but rather that, as the old bird is burning, the new one is already forming in the ashes, so that before the conflagration is complete there are already various organic filaments joining themselves together to form into the new Phoenix which is to arise from the funeral pyre of the old.

In these days when it looks almost as if the destruction of civilization, which was not completed by the war, was being completed by a peace which is worse than war, it seems to me that these international educational relationships which are the subject of our discussion today can be at least one source of comfort to us. The nations of the world have well nigh destroyed one another and the destruction has not yet stopped, but at any rate in all the suspicion and dickerings and misery we can see at least one group of organic filaments joining themselves together and forming what we hope will be eventually a better civilization with better international relationships than we have ever had in the past.

On that account, in taking on the administration of the Rhodes Scholarships in this country, it seemed to me that this was a particularly auspicious time; that the Scholarships in the thirteen years of their existence before they were interrupted by the war had never had one-tenth of the importance that they were likely to have in the new era, which is now beginning.

I am glad to say that the conditions under which we are to administer the Scholarships have been made very much better, very much simpler, and will leave us very much less hampered in the future than we have been in the past. I shall venture to repeat, just in a

word, some of these changes, lest they should not have been brought to the attention of all of you, since we were compelled to organize the competition last year in very great haste.

In the first place the old qualifying examination in Latin, Greek and mathematics, which was such a bone of contention throughout the country, is not any longer a matter of practical politics. It has been abandoned. We are now choosing Rhodes Scholars entirely on their record, entirely from an American point of view. Candidates do not now have to take any examination in order to win a Scholarship.

Of course, the Rhodes Trust is not the University of Oxford and this regulation on the part of the Rhodes Trust does not alter in the least the regulations at Oxford, but Oxford is doing its part by altering its own regulations.

The requirement of Greek has been partially done away with at Oxford. The University has gone so far as to say that it will admit graduates of approved American institutions to senior standing in the future with exemption from Greek and from all examinations. I understand that no official list will be made at present of institutions which may be considered "approved" under this statute. Each case will be considered on its merits, and the University of Oxford will, of course, have to be guided to a large extent by lists which have been made in this country. Eventually there will be a list founded on precedent, if not on statute, and it will be possible to know what standing a Rhodes Scholar from a given institution will receive.

However, I am glad to say that that is likely to be a matter of small importance. At the time that this legislation was passed there was introduced into the University a statute to do away with the requirement of Greek altogether. This statute narrowly failed of passing last spring and it was reintroduced on November 11; if it passes it will, as far as those Scholarships are concerned, make it less important exactly what list of insti-

tutions are considered approved. The battle over that statute is now raging. There will be news on that subject (which I shall not fail to distribute to our colleges) in the spring.*

The second change which I wish to speak of is that the appointment of Rhodes Scholars has now been put into the hands of the ex-Rhodes Scholars in this country. They are men who know about Oxford and they are men who are interested, in a way that perhaps few people who have not been in Oxford can realize, in getting satisfactory representatives of the United States.

In the past fifteen years we have sent over a great many good men to Oxford. That fact has sometimes been lost sight of in the criticism that has been made of poor men. But it is perfectly impossible that 48 states so unequal as ours are should send over equally good men every year. The average population of a state in the country is 2,000,000, but we have some as low as 100,000. You cannot get as good men year after year from a state of 100,000 as you can one of 5,000,000; it cannot be done. The Rhodes Scholars have always been unequal and I don't think we can entirely do away with that inequality. But we are anxious to bring the extremes as near together as possible. To that end we are going to ask our Committees not to appoint men when they have no good candidate. We are going to refuse to make appointments in some states. I say that frankly because, while it did not happen this year, it will happen in the future and I think myself it is perfectly proper that it should happen, and that it is to the interest of the states concerned that it should. I think it is for the interest of every state that it should be well represented in Oxford and that it should not be represented at all unless it is represented by an outstanding man. I hope in most cases we shall be able to discover satisfactory material and I believe that the

*By vote of Convocation on March 2 compulsory Greek was abolished.

Rhodes Scholars, 400 of whom are now scattered throughout the country, will be able to do something in discovering that material.

Another happy feature of the Rhodes Scholarships, another new feature, is that they have recently established at Oxford, in line with all the other universities in Great Britain, the degree of Ph. D. It has always been possible to do research work at Oxford. It has always been possible for any student doing research work there to get just as much individual attention as he needed. But the degree which Oxford has given for a research course, corresponding to the work done for the American Ph. D., meant nothing in the United States. From now on it will be possible for men who do research to get a degree which has the same name that we are accustomed to for that kind of work and that, of course, will be rather to the advantage of the men.

All of these changes have combined to produce the extraordinarily keen competition for the Scholarships this past year. But probably no one of these factors is as important as the new interest in foreign affairs and the new interest in England which has grown out of the war. Whatever the reason is we have had a competition for the Scholarships this last year many times keener than we have ever had before. It may be that some of you have had candidates whom you thought well of who have been disappointed in getting a Scholarship. That is not surprising. The fact is, we have been forced to turn away a great many good men. I am glad to say, in view of the keenness of this competition and in view of the fact that some of the men who have had Scholarships unfilled as yet were killed in the war, that the Rhodes Trust has said that we could appoint three Scholars-at-large from among these disappointed candidates. We have sixty-seven men especially recommended for these three appointments and a Committee is going to sit down pretty soon to the rather difficult task of picking out three from those sixty-seven.

Now, I want to say just a word about the kind of

men we want for Rhodes Scholarships. When you send a man to Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar you are sending a man to an institution where standards of scholarship are very definite and very severe. I think that we can all of us agree that in American institutions and American education generally (and this does not apply merely to one class of institution, but to all institutions) our standards of scholarship are not very definite nor very severe. We have a great many students of intellectual distinction in our colleges, but we have a very inadequate and clumsy machinery for indicating it. Because a man gets A in his courses we cannot be sure that he has intellectual distinction. Our own standards are,—I am not saying whether it is wise or not—but our own standards are not very clear in that respect. In order to indicate these few men of distinction one must have a standard which is severe, which is even cruel and which rejects a certain very estimable type of man who has done everything that he has been asked to do, who has read all he has been asked to read, who remembers all the things he has been asked to remember, who has attended all the classes he has been asked to attend, but who somehow or another has not got that grasp of things in the large, that power over his subject which indicates distinction.

We have not as a nation adopted such severe standards as I have just indicated. You may have them in some of your colleges, but in the majority you have not. You have students of intellectual distinction, but your standards do not mark these students off from their fellows as sharply as the facts warrant. This makes the task imposed upon us in selecting Rhodes Scholars somewhat harder than it would otherwise be. For the Scholarships we are trying to secure men who have either intellectual or personal distinction. Rhodes wished to secure men who, either in personal character or intellect, rose above their fellows and had the ability which was likely to make them leaders in future life. The success of the scheme depends on our being able to secure these men.

Now I do not think I need to say very much about the value of the opportunity which the Scholarships present. I know that it is appreciated by you college presidents because of the fact that we have been for the last few years simply unable to find Rhodes Scholars for all the positions in colleges and universities which are offered to them. I wish that we had many more men for teaching positions, because already I think the Scholarships have demonstrated themselves as a first-class introduction to a teaching career. Some of us were a little nervous about this at first because it seemed that a man going out of his country to do graduate work might find difficulty in getting a position. I am glad to say that that has not proved to be the case.

I think the Scholarships have demonstrated their value as a preparation for the practice of law. In this City of Chicago, in Boston, in New York, and in San Francisco, and in many other cities Rhodes Scholars are already numbered among the most promising of the young lawyers.

But the Scholarships have another value which in these days is even more important. None of us knows what is going to happen in the world. We cannot tell what is going to happen in this League of Nations, whether we are going to enter it or not; whether it is going to be a success if we do enter it. Perhaps the world never faced a darker future than it does at the present moment. But if there is anything clear, if there is any point or policy which is clear, it seems to me that it is that the nations which have institutions of the kind that we believe in have got to stand together to insure the preservation of those institutions in the future.

Now, we have not been very conscious in the past of our debt, of our unity, of the way in which our country has been molded on the lines of Anglo-Saxon civilization. We have not been very conscious of that. We have, perhaps, estimated at too high a rate those features of our constitution which differ from the law of other English speaking countries. Yet the experience of the

war, the clash of civilizations, and the discussion of constitutional questions which have grown out of it have brought us face to face with an appalling danger. We see now that the civilization which we believed in, which we stand for, is not the only civilization in the world; that it is not necessarily the most powerful; it can be the most powerful only if it is united.

We have a dozen or so independent nations speaking the English language, owing their laws and their liberal ideas to the English stock. They have been going their own way heedless of one another, very often subject to criticism from one another. But behind all that I think we have all become more and more conscious of the necessity for the standing together of the English speaking countries of the world to preserve the institutions which they believe in against this rivalry of other civilizations, this rivalry of other ideas, of constitutions and of policy which is so intense throughout the world at the present time.

And, that, I think, suggests the deeper meaning, the international importance of the Scholarships. The man who gave them, gave them because he felt that that was the greatest and most important end that his wealth could serve. He said at one time, in one of the discarded clauses of his will, that he hoped the world would see sometime a union of all the English speaking countries of the world, if necessary under the American flag. That was the extent to which Cecil Rhodes went. And that meaning of the Rhodes Scholarships is becoming more and more clear every day and is ultimately going to be of very great significance in this country.

IV. George H. Nettleton, The American University Union in Europe.

The American University Union in Europe was formally organized in New York City at a meeting held June 6, 1917. The first discussion by the founders of the title of the organization emphasized two significant points. It was decided to call it a University Union, not a University

club. The primary purpose of the Union was to serve American college men and their friends in military service in the cause of the Allies overseas, but it was felt from the outset that it should recognize possibilities of service beyond those of social convenience. Hence, with a memory of the usage at Oxford and Cambridge, and with a desire likewise to emphasize the essential unity of American university interests abroad, the term Union was chosen.

I shall say simply a word about the war work of the Union. The fact that in Paris, London and Rome, the Union enrolled during the war over 35,000 American college men from 540 different American colleges suggests that its chosen title was not ill-advised. I remember that it was said before the meeting for organization that there was a danger that American colleges and universities accustomed to recognize their own individual, if not rival, interests in the past, would not co-operate thoroughly and unselfishly. But the magnificent thing about the spirit of American college men (and women, let me add) in war-service abroad, was this, that there was a genuine union of those who recognized one faith, one hope, one common loyalty. I think it may be a helpful thing for American colleges in times of peace that, under the unusual stress of war conditions, there was developed definitely between them a greater solidarity of feeling, a larger mutual sympathy, a deeper sense that our points of similarity in American colleges far exceed our points of difference, a clearer recognition that we are working after all for one goal. Hence the term American University Union was, and is, significant.

In the second place, it was a Union in *Europe*. It was felt from the outset that its immediate war-service would be primarily in France. It was recognized also from the beginning that its service would be elsewhere as well,—in Great Britain, in Italy. Hence the title adopted was "The American University Union in Europe." It was interesting to see in the two years of war-service of the Union how rapidly its Continental interests developed. An interchange of visits between its representatives and those of the Uni-

versity of Geneva, for example, an invitation from Belgian governmental authorities for the Union to consider establishing a branch in Brussels to cement relations between Belgian and American Universities after the war, and visits to the Union of delegations from Denmark, from the University of Athens, from a number of Continental countries, showed that a real object was being served in the maintenance in Paris of central headquarters for American University interests on the Continent. The Italian Branch of the Union, with offices at Rome, directly furthered friendly Italo-American educational relations. Professor McKenzie, its Director, lectured on American universities at various Italian universities, and investigated the facilities for American students in Italy.

I remember the saying of a professor in the Sorbonne that not until the foundation of the American University Union had they realized in France how much actually could be accomplished by having one definite center as a clearing house for international educational interests, and as a common meeting-ground for university men of different nationalities. If we wish to cultivate close intellectual relations between England and America, France and America, Italy and America, the element of personal contact, the chance for the meeting in one common center, of scholars and students of different nationalities but of kindred intellectual interests cannot be disregarded.

The Union aims to be a bond between American and foreign universities, and thereby to contribute to mutual understanding and good will. How far its purposes and work abroad are recognized is best judged from the opinion of disinterested observers rather than those immediately connected with its work. For that reason I quote an extract from one of the many public utterances of Monsieur Tardieu, to whom the Union owes a debt which it is impossible to put adequately in words. In this he expresses the fundamental principles that underlie the work which the Union is trying to do. Though he interprets these principles in terms of Franco-American relations, they are equally appli-

cable to the relation of American educational interest to those of other European countries.

"Franco-American friendship finds one of its most solid foundations in the realm of ideals and learning, in the persistent progress of moral and intellectual exchanges between our countries. One of the most important and valuable results of the contest in which we have fought and triumphed together for Right and Freedom is that the relations between American universities and French universities have developed on a larger and newer scale, thus multiplying the bonds that unite them. The American and French universities will contribute materially in establishing the friendship of France and the United States on an indestructible basis for the greatest good of our two countries and in the interests of the World's Peace. This the American University Union has understood perfectly. It has been not only the intellectual home of the American army in France, it has been an admirable center of Franco-American friendship. The work it has done during the war with a far-sighted enthusiasm must endure after the war. The American University Union wishes to have in Paris a permanent home. In the name of the French Government I am glad to extend to the Union my most cordial wishes for the success of its undertaking."

This is the judgment of a man of affairs as to the importance of continuing between the countries those direct educational relations which are a bond of mutual sympathy and contribute in reality to friendship and good will between nations. In reference to the closing words of Monsieur Tardieu, let me say simply this, that they refer to the offer of the Municipal Council of Paris of an admirable site worth \$100,000, near the University of Paris, in the midst of the educational institutions of the city, for a permanent building for the American University Union in Europe, to serve as a center for American students and educational interests, and as a clearing house for questions relating to international education,—to continue, in short, the work already inaugurated by the Union. It is the belief of

the French Governmental and Municipal authorities that the bonds established in time of war should be continued in times of peace.

For my own part, I believe that there is a special significance in this offer from France. I said the site was worth \$100,000. I should not have put it that way. Our American standards of values, I believe, have changed since we entered the war. Before the war, we used to ask, "What is a man worth?" And the answer came instinctively in terms of dollars and cents. I will not put the offer of France on terms like that. Its worth, I think we shall all recognize, is beyond the actual financial value of the property. To those who know the spirit of France the offer has a peculiar significance. That soil of which France was unwilling to cede one inch to hostile aggression during the war, it now proposes generously to yield to the force of friendship.

The same generosity of spirit toward the Union is manifest in Great Britain. I wish I could tell you in detail of the hearty co-operation of many representatives of the British Government and British educational institutions. I am glad that one of them whom I knew in London is here present. I recall the words of Mr. Fisher, President of the Board of Education in Great Britain, at one of our American University Union dinners in London. He said in substance, "I am glad to attend a meeting of American college men here because it was to the American colleges that the United States owed its primary impulse to enter the war and it was to the American colleges that the government looked for most immediate and most significant response to the nation's need." I remember what Lord Bryce said at another of our gatherings, that he thought for the future peace of the world nothing was more important than the solidarity of Anglo-American sentiment; that he thought that the most enduring bond of that friendship was that between the American and British universities; and that he welcomed the Union as a direct means of bringing together the British and American universities. The Universities Bureau of the British

Empire has taken at 50 Russell Square a house in which, by the courtesy of the British authorities, the American University Union in Europe has its permanent London headquarters.

We believe, accordingly, that the work of the Union, thus cordially supported by foreign governmental and educational leaders, should continue. The Union from the start has wished to work in entire co-operation with all the agencies that make for international education and good will. It is a privilege to meet together here. There is between us no diversity of interest. There is a general wish, I am sure, on the part of all those connected with the Union to work in complete harmony and sympathy with other agencies whose interests are allied.

The American University Union has, we think, to a very marked degree the personal interest and sympathy of many American college men whom it sought to serve during the war. We hope that on that basis of good will its work will continue. In this have co-operated many institutions. I am glad to say that fifty representative American universities and colleges have already signified their intention of maintaining the Union for its work in times of peace. Its Board of Trustees, chosen on a representative basis, includes the presidents or chief executives of ten American universities and colleges, and officers and professors of other institutions. The Association of American Colleges chooses, and has already selected, three representatives as Trustees of the Union. The Union is thus not an organization of individuals, but of recognized American institutions of higher learning, with a Board of Trustees representing alike state and privately endowed institutions throughout different parts of the United States.

I am equally glad to say that the trustees at their last meeting unanimously decided to convert an organization, which necessarily during the war was concerned with the interests of American college men, into one open on equal terms of membership to the women's colleges. The Union thus aims to serve American students, women as well as men,

on terms of entire equality. For this the American University Union needs the support of individual colleges. The membership fee itself is relatively small but the advantages of working together in harmony and in co-operation are large. I think that the two years' experience of the Union abroad presents to us a basis of actual achievement and proof of the necessity of permanently organizing abroad American college and educational interests, and of maintaining those opportunities for personal contact between American and European scholars and students which directly contribute to mutual understanding, sympathy and good will.

I thank you, Mr. President, for this opportunity of presenting briefly some aspects of a work which, in the judgment of many recognized educational leaders at home and abroad, is of significance not merely to American colleges but to friendly relations between the nations served.

Dr. J. R. Harker (Illinois Wesleyan University): I wish to ask a question, sir, which may be in my own mind alone, but yet may be in the mind of several. This is called the American University Union. Now, in this country we differentiate quite clearly between Universities and Colleges. I assume, however, that this includes both universities and colleges. The question was partially answered but I would like to have it directly answered.

Mr. George H. Nettleton: Yes, sir, you are entirely right. For economy of title, the shorter term was adopted with the feeling that "university" would cover all academic relations.

Dr. Harker: Thank you.

Dr. Nettleton: There were included, and are now included in the Union higher schools of technology, such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, universities both state and privately endowed, colleges large and small and, as shall hope to add, the women's colleges—all on exactly the same terms.

The President: Professor Nettleton, you spoke of the representatives of 540 colleges and universities having reg-

istered in the headquarters of the Unions in Paris and in London and in Rome. How many colleges and universities were, during the war, members of the Union?

Dr. Nettleton: There were, I believe, 142 colleges and universities.

The President: What I wanted to bring out was this, that in that war work you made no distinction as to whether it was membership or not?

Dr. Nettleton: We made no distinction. There were fifteen American universities and colleges that sent accredited delegates to the organization meeting in New York. Then the movement grew so rapidly that most colleges that had any large number of men serving overseas joined. Hence we thought that it was unfair to make any discrimination, and from the first the Union was open to all colleges on equal terms. The actual financial support came from over 140.

The President: Just one more question, Dr. Nettleton, for information because this is thrown open now to women's colleges, as you have just said, what is the present membership, the number of colleges and universities that are members.

Dr. Nettleton: There are over fifty that have thus far signified their intention of going on. In the 140 during the war, necessarily there were some smaller institutions, not even perhaps of the full grade of college, that made contribution, desiring to aid in the important war work. Their interests in international education are perhaps naturally less. The difficulty with the financial situation in the American colleges is also an added factor, but the fact that fifty institutions of recognized standing have already signified their willingness to contribute and sustain their membership in the Union is, I think, in itself significant.

V. Stephen P. Duggan, The Institute of International Education.

I suppose it is not unfair to say that when the Great War broke out we were a provincial people. Americans for more than a century have been devoting their time and

their energy and their thought to developing the natural resources of this great country of ours and our foreign policy has been to a considerable extent to keep aloof from the entanglements associated with close relations with foreign countries.

When the war came, it found us unprepared to understand a good many of the issues at stake. But the war was a great educator for us. Interest was aroused in nearly all the problems that had arisen throughout the world.

Some of us in New York thought it would be most unfortunate if the war were to end and the great interest aroused in international relations and in the problems and difficulties of other people were to wane. Hence a group of us formed an organization to appeal for funds in order to form some kind of institution whose sole purpose would be to keep alive an interest in international relations in order to develop international good will. After all, international good will can only be founded on knowledge, a knowledge of the difficulties and problems of other peoples, in order to enter into sympathetic relations with them.

We formed such an organization and we appealed to the great Endowments for financial assistance. This was before we went into the war and before, therefore, the American University Union or the American Council on Education was in existence.

When the war came, the Council on Education made a strong appeal for support of some kind for an organization that was going to interest itself in international relations. The result was that with this corroboratory proof for need of it on the part of the new organization the money was forthcoming. The International Institution of Education was founded and I became its Director.

The Institute is a distinct organization. On its board of trustees are representatives of the endowed universities, the state universities, the women's colleges and the men's colleges as well as of most international activities: e. g., international law is represented by John Bassett Moore, international diplomacy by Henry Morgenthau, international finance by Dwight Morrow, and so forth.

Now, the fact that there was some need of a central clearing house of advice and information in this country was obvious just as soon as the Institute was established. The peoples abroad, even today, after all the intercourse we have had as a result of the war know very little about us and about our institutions of learning, and we know comparatively little about them.

The first week that the Institute was founded and I, a new man, was established in it, thirty Brazilian students came into my office and with the fine assistance of Professor Monroe of Columbia University we were able to properly distribute them. These thirty Brazilian students varied from coal black to pure white because in Brazil they have solved the color question by allowing absolute intermarriage and there is no distinction of caste. The need of such an organization as the Institute was essential because practically every one of those students wanted to study a different thing. One wanted to study citrus fruits. When you are asked about engineering and law and medicine, it is easy but when you are asked, "Where shall I go to study about citrus fruits; where shall I go to study about the chemistry of India rubber?", it is more difficult. Moreover, the student who wanted to study citrus fruits was rather black. We couldn't send him to Florida and we couldn't tell him why. We sent him to California instead.

I wanted to build the Institute on the foundations already made and the first thing I did was to send a questionnaire to all of the colleges and universities to get information about exchanging professorships and students with foreign countries. I sent a questionnaire which I thought was very well organized because it could be answered in yes or no only, and I got about 70 per cent of answers, which, I understand, is a very big percentage.

This questionnaire was organized to find out whether American institutions would receive foreign professors and upon what terms they would receive them; whether they would give fellowships to foreign students; whether the fellowships would provide tuition or tuition and board;

whether the colleges would send students abroad and whether they would give scholarships for such students; and whether they would send professors abroad and upon what terms; in other words I tried to get as much information as possible upon the subject of exchanges.

I went abroad after I had secured this information and visited most of the countries of Western and Southern Europe.

I was very much pleased with the great interest shown on the part of the peoples of all those countries over there to get into closer co-operation and correlation with the United States.

The university authorities and the government officials everywhere showed a desire to modify conditions in their institutions in order to attract American students. In England they had just adopted the Ph. D. degree. In France they were discussing what modifications might be made in the course of study, and even in the requirements for admission. In Switzerland they were asking what changes might be made in order to make students comfortable physically as well as what changes might be made in the curricula of their institutions there.

I came back to the United States with the conviction that to a great extent the old process was going to be reversed. The old process was that foreign professors came to our country and that our students went abroad, particularly to Germany. I am rather convinced, as a result of my study, that that process will be reversed; that no longer are many of our students going abroad. I do not mean that no students will go abroad. Students will always go to France and Great Britain and Italy and other countries to study specific subjects. But I do not think the large numbers that hitherto went abroad will go. The great efforts that the United States made during the war and the evidences of what American colleges can themselves do will have a retarding influence. From the missions that have come to my office from Japan and China and Latin America over and over again, as well as from my experience in

Europe, I find a great desire on the part of students from abroad to come to our own country.

Now, with reference to professors; I discovered that the universities in Europe were very much congested with students. In practically all of the countries the students had been out of the universities for four years and they are now coming back all at once. A great many of the universities are under-manned. Many of the professors are still in government service. They are under-manned; they are congested; they are poor.

The old method was that the home country supported the professor it sent abroad. It will be with considerable difficulty that foreign countries can do that now. If we are going to have foreign professors, therefore, the United States, it seems to me, will have to provide the means whereby they may come. This will also be largely true of the foreign students who are going to come here. They are going to come primarily, of course, for what we can give them, just as our students went to Germany for what they thought they could get there. It does seem to me that because of the heroic efforts made in the war by the countries abroad and because of their impoverishment it is our duty to provide as many scholarships and fellowships as our colleges and universities can, in order to make comfortable the students in the foreign countries who are looking forward to coming here. I do not mean that this should be continued as a permanent policy but only until the nations of Europe become sufficiently stabilized to resume normal relations.

I said in the beginning that I think one of the most important ways of developing international good will is to spread among our own people a knowledge of the problems and difficulties of other people. So I have taken over under my charge in the Institute the International Polity Clubs that have existed in our colleges. These International Polity Clubs are organizations of students and teachers in our colleges devoted to the study of specific problems in international relations. They are not propagandist organizations

of any kind. They are trying to make a scientific and detached study of the problems that confront the world at the present time.

Now, what we try to do in any institution is to provide the material for such a study. If such an International Relations Club is founded in an institution under the protection of some member of the faculty who is deeply interested in international affairs and gathers a group about him of anywhere from twenty to fifty students, we will send him the books, journals and pamphlets and whatever else is necessary to make a study of that problem. We get scholars in specific fields to draw up a bibliography and we send a syllabus and the bibliography to the professor in charge. For example, this fall I have been sending out to those institutions which have International Relations Clubs the material on both sides of the problem of the Adriatic, of Shantung, and of the Near East.

These are only a few of the ways, however, in which an institution like this might function. For example, while I was abroad, I found a great deal of confusion existing among university authorities as to our degrees and as to how they might organize equivalence between their degrees and ours. Since I have been back here I have received letters from college and university presidents wondering whether the Institute would undertake in any way to evaluate the degrees of foreign students. Only recently I got a letter from one university president who said, "We have in our institution here students with French lycée degrees, Latin American liceo degrees, degrees from Japan and degrees from all over the world and we do not know how to evaluate them. Moreover, we find, too, that one great university will accept a lycée degree for entrance to its work for the doctorate and that another will not. The result is great confusion." I determined as soon as this Institute was founded not in any way to encroach upon a field of work that was being undertaken by anyone else. As Dr. Capen is going to consider this problem I shall not. Similarly, in my relation with the American University Union. We act

in complete harmony. The Union functions in France and Great Britain and I am their representative here. I have organized in a number of the European countries, and am now organizing in Latin America, representatives, so that the information or advice needed by those countries or needed by us may be had. I have been very glad to offer to the educational representatives of foreign countries in the United States desk room and whatever stenographic and clerical assistance may be needed to carry on this work here.

It is not merely in these purely educational ways, however, that work may be done to help international good will. The House Commission of Inquiry that was organized to draw up what we thought was the best ways of solving some of the disputed problems of the War soon discovered a great lack of material in this country on specific problems. Some of the government reports and a great deal of the statistical material that was needed could be found nowhere, not even in the Library of Congress. We had to send abroad for it. The American Library Association met in this city last week and I said to them then, "This is an International Institute and I cannot help libraries except in the international field but if you will draw up lists of statistical material, government reports and other things that we have not complete sets of in this country, I will send them around to the university and great public libraries and have them checked off. Then we can draw up a list of all the statistical material and government reports of the world, where they may be found in this country. In that way we will avoid the competition for the purchase of foreign government reports and statistical material that is going on now. If Harvard has secured a copy it could be sent to Johns Hopkins, if they needed it, and vice versa.

There was established during the War the National Research Council. It was the result of the splendid work done by the scientists of our colleges and universities for the government during the War. Since the armistice an International Research Council has been established. There is no National Council of Humanistic Studies. But there is

a movement on foot at the present time in this country and in the other countries to establish an organization for the development of interest in the humanistic branches. Representatives will meet in my office within a few weeks to found the American branch.

The next thing that I want to do is to try to bring to this country from Latin America some teachers from the normal schools down there. That is the best way to spread American influence down there. Another way to spread American influence there and abroad generally is to send professors abroad to teach in foreign countries. Nearly all those countries want our professors. But we have no government support for our professors going abroad. I evolved a scheme therefore which I placed before my board of trustees and which, I am glad to say, they accepted and appropriated \$12,500 in order to carry out. The idea is as follows:

I came back from Europe with the knowledge that they want our professors there, the new countries as well as the old countries. I suggested, therefore, to the Board to make use of the men coming up every year on sabbatical leave, who have a full year on half pay, or a half year on full pay. If some of these men with the half year on full pay and the additional three months in summer went to teach in a foreign country they would have about eight months at their disposal. But the cost of trans-oceanic travel at the present time is very, very great. It costs \$800 to go to Constantinople and back today or \$1200 to Shanghai and back. I suggested therefore, that one of the things the Institute could do was to provide the cost of transportation for sabbatical year men going abroad to teach, and I am glad to say that my Board agreed.

In conclusion may I say that these are only a few ways in which the Institute can function and I would be very grateful if any of you gentlemen would write to me and indicate other ways in which it might serve the cause of international good will and American education.

VI. Samuel P. Capen, The American Council on Education.

In the field of International Educational Relations the American Council on Education has a past. Just how much of its past is its own and how much belongs to some other body has on occasions been the subject of more or less good natured debate. However, I suspect there would be general acceptance of the following summary as presenting a modest estimate of the Council's contributions to the development of international educational relations.

a. The Council took charge of the visit of the British Educational Mission last year at the request of the Council of National Defense. It secured the money to pay the expenses of the Mission. It planned the Mission's itinerary and was responsible for its entertainment.

b. It assisted also in entertaining and directing the travels of the French Educational Missions.

c. It secured certain scholarships for Russian students in 1918.

d. It lent its aid and its blessing to the admirable enterprise of this Association in bringing French girls to American colleges on scholarships.

e. Through its Committee on International Educational Relations it took part in projecting the Institute of International Education.

So much for the past. The future activities of the Council in this field remain still to be defined. It is safe to say that when the various higher educational interests decided last spring to put the Council on a permanent basis with an executive office in Washington, they expected it to function largely as a clearing house for international exchanges, perhaps to be the principal agency for the conduct of such exchanges. But while the Council's budget was being raised and before its office was opened, the face of nature changed. The Institute of International Education was created. The American University Union in Europe was reorganized. Your own Association extended its relationships with France. The Society for

American Fellowships at French Universities was established. Serbian students were brought to this country by still another agency. The Council awoke to find its projected international tasks very largely taken over by others.

Personally, I am not repining and I think the Council's officers generally are quite content. Experience has shown that there are numerous bodies that can take part in the organization of international exchanges, many that are eager to be concerned in them. On the other hand, there is a group of domestic problems of the first importance which affect the whole of American higher education. These problems are peculiarly the sphere of the American Council on Education, because the Council is the only body that represents all the higher educational interests. In fulfilling its obligations in this sphere alone, the Council will find ample use for all its resources. No other existing agency can undertake precisely these tasks. This is not the time to indicate what the tasks are, but perhaps I shall have another opportunity to outline them to you.

Nevertheless, the American Council on Education cannot wholly evacuate the international field, even if it should desire to do so. And that is not its desire. It seems to me that the Council has two important responsibilities with reference to the foreign relations of American higher education. First, it must participate whenever the college world as a whole is brought into contact with foreign institutions, and second, it must seek, because of its broadly representative character again, to bring about co-operative action among the various agencies now active in this field. May I dwell on the last point for a moment?

Thus far, I believe, there has been very little duplication among the agencies engaged in promoting international educational relations. But there has been immense confusion of mind as the result of their activities. Persons who have been in Europe recently tell me that foreigners are absolutely bewildered by the large num-

ber of bodies concerning themselves with the exchanges of students and professors. The confusion of mind is not confined to Europe. Our own educational authorities do not know to whom to turn for information or assistance in these matters. Now, this is most unfortunate and should be remedied without delay. In my own judgment, the remedy is very simple. It consists in the mutual sharing of plans by the several agencies, in the agreement to take joint action wherever practicable, and in the wide advertisement of such agreement. There is no place for competition in the field of international relations. The business of carrying on international exchanges both of professors and students is an enormous enterprise and a growing one. Clearly there are not now being applied to it either enough men or enough money to perform it in a manner adequate to the needs and desires of American institutions. There must be no lost motion due to remediable causes.

The American Council on Education has already taken two steps consistent with this definition of its responsibilities. It has signed an agreement with the Institute of International Education and the American University Union in Europe which described the objects and scope of each of the three organizations and specifies the areas of joint action. I quote the sections of this agreement which define the position of the Council, because they elucidate my statement of a moment ago that the Council must participate whenever the college world as a whole is brought into contact with foreign institutions.

"The major activities of the Council lie in the field of American education. It is primarily concerned with the interrelations of American institutions and organizations and with their relations to governmental agencies. In the field of international educational relations, however, it undertakes to perform the following functions:

- a. In view of the recognition of the Council by the State Department and the Bureau of Education as offi-

cially representing American higher education, it will receive communications bearing on international educational relations sent by foreign Governments to the Government of the United States and involving action on the part of American colleges and universities. The Director of the Council will keep the Director of the Institute and the Secretary of the Union informed of the nature and objects of these communications and of the action thereon proposed by the Council. He will seek the assistance of the Institute or the Union, or both, in carrying out such projects wherever practicable. This arrangement will not preclude the Institute or the Union from receiving communications from or making communications to, foreign governments directly if the occasion seems to call for it.

b. The Council will endeavor to bring about a greater uniformity of procedure among the bodies now defining standards of American higher institutions. It undertakes to interpret to educational officials of foreign countries prevailing standards and existing lists of accredited or approved institutions. It will keep the Institute and the Union currently informed of its action in these matters.

c. The Council proposes to take up with the institutions and organizations included in its membership the question of the appropriate academic rating at American institutions of graduates of French lycées, Spanish or Latin-American liceos, and other foreign institutions, to the end that American colleges and universities may adopt a consistent and uniform policy toward holders of foreign degrees and certificates. It undertakes to communicate to the Institute and the Union whatever policy may be adopted by its constituent organizations and institutions. The Institute and the Union will in turn circulate this information abroad through their respective foreign offices and correspondents.

The Council, the Institute and the Union will cooperate in welcoming and entertaining official delegations of foreign scholars and in directing their travels

so that they may secure the maximum benefit from their visit to the United States."

The Council has taken another tentative step intended to promote co-operative action. It has proposed to the officers of this Association, to the Union, the Institute, and to representatives of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, the formation of a joint committee to have charge of the selection of American young people who are sent abroad on scholarships offered by foreign Governments. The Committee would also advise in the selection of American institutions to which foreign students should be sent.

Both of these tasks are highly important. The honor and prestige of the United States are involved. It is of the utmost moment that the young people sent abroad to represent us should be our best, and that the institutions to which foreigners go should be thoroughly reputable. Neither task concerns any limited group of institutions alone. They concern all American higher education. If my conception of the functions of the American Council on Education is correct, it is peculiarly the Council's place to initiate co-operative action in these larger matters which affect us all. I bespeak from the Association of the American Colleges the favorable consideration of this proposal.

VII. J. J. Champenois, The French Department of Education.

I want to thank you all for the opportunity you have given me of expressing my thanks, my own personal thanks as well as the thanks of the University Association I am representing in this country, for the very fine opportunity you have given to me of explaining to you the way in which we have conceived our work and the way in which I hope to be able to conduct that work in this country, thanks to your very fine cooperation and efforts.

After all, Mr. Chairman, I owe you a personal explanation of my presence in this country. You do not

know me and I do not know you. I have written to you and you have written to me but it was time, really, for us to meet. Well, we have met. I am looking for more opportunities of meeting you again. As my friend, Professor Nettleton, whom I remember meeting in Paris, said a few nights ago: "After all, it is only the personal contact that counts." Professor Nettleton knows the people I am working with. They are not bad people and they have got something clear in their minds and I believe that Professor Nettleton was able to appreciate their qualities when he was over there.

You know exactly how the exchange of students and the bringing over of 182 French girl students was arranged in 1917 and 1918. Dr. Kelly has given you the figures.

The fact stands today that we have in this country, in various American colleges, universities and institutions, a large number of French girl scholars and men scholars. The fact is not known. Nobody knows anything about it.

Some days ago I received a note from the editor of a very well known journal: "Can't you write an article about what has been done, if anything has been done at all, in the way of exchanges of students?" I said: "My dear man, a good deal has been done." He didn't know anything about it. It is up to you to make it known. It is your work and you should be proud of it.

May I say a few things for Dr. Kelly's own personal information? In 1913, there was published a book which I have here on my table. Please, bear the date in mind, 1913. The author of this volume is one of the leading French historians, namely Gabriel Hanotaux. Mr. Hanotaux knows something about this country and has always endeavored to establish permanent intellectual relations between this country and France; this is what the writer says:

"There is much to learn from the United States. Young Frenchmen would gain much by crossing the ocean and staying several months or years in the United

States. A young Frenchman, staying in the United States, would learn to become a 'real man' and a stay in the States would have the same value to him as a fresh air cure."

Not my words, Mr. Chairman, but my own ideas. "This fresh air cure would mean that the average Frenchman would rid himself of the average European prejudice and that the French student would know a little more about initiative, personal judgment and activity."

And what about women? "I wish,"—the writer says—"that young French girls might have the same advantages, because in the United States there are numerous institutions in which the intellectual training of girls is infinitely superior to anything that has been done in either England, Belgium or France.

"The American girl is the finest product of the New World. A French girl coming over to the United States will lose nothing of her charm but will gain much in self control."

These words, gentlemen, were written and published in 1913. They are not my words but they express my ideas and such, indeed, is the spirit in which I am conducting my work. Thanks to the efforts of the Association of American Colleges, the idea that was just an idea in 1913 has become a real live thing today.

And, of course, when it came to the actual embodying of the idea, many obstacles were in the way. We had to select suitable candidates. It is not always that you hit upon the right person, but Dean Benton, of Carleton College, a friend of mine, and Mrs. Stocks Millar, and the two French members of the Committee of Selection seem to have done their work with fairly good success.

Of course, mistakes were made in 1917. Mistakes were made because things were not very well organized the first year, but I know, from personal experience, that the selection was more successful in 1919. As a matter of fact, it was easier.

Now, from the American side, and I can speak

feelingly of the question, those French girls, as well as the men, have received nothing but intelligent guidance and handsome treatment from the heads of American colleges; guidance, ladies and gentlemen, is the essential point. I remember that twenty years ago I struck out for myself and, for ten years, there was nobody to guide me and I want our young girls and our young men to be guided; I want them to be guided by people of your standing.

Now, there is one thing I must say: Some minutes ago I put Dr. Kelly to the blush and I am going to put him again to the blush. I want to say this: But for Dr. Kelly, the kind of work we have successfully conducted would have been impossible.

I know Dr. Kelly very well today, but he knows me far better than I know him. Every time a difficulty has come up,—and some difficulties have come up,—I have always made it a point to submit it to Dr. Kelly and in him I have always found experience and tolerance and knowledge of life and knowledge of work, and that slow, gentle touch which should be used when it comes to the handling of girls.

To a man of my years the handling of 200 girls is a very hard thing. I remember writing to a friend of mine: "I have about 180 French girls in my charge and I wish I had the command of a division of rough-necks instead."

But, in any case, let me tell you very plainly that, as soon as I landed in this country, three months ago, the first thing I did, and you may remember it, was to get in touch with the heads of colleges and with the girls. I asked you a few leading questions, and asked the girls the same questions. From the replies, and the correspondence I have received from you and from our scholars, girls as well as men, I may safely say that the results today are better than I could possibly hope them to be. If ever you come up to my office in New York, you may go over my files and find out for yourselves whether I am right or wrong.

But, now, Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask you: Can we possibly appreciate the results which a one or two or three years' stay in an American college will cause? What will be the result on an average French girl of an American education?

My answer is that it is impossible for you, as well as for myself, to say exactly the way in which the influence of this country is going to work out in those young folks' minds. It is too subtle; it is not concrete; we cannot grasp it. But let me tell you something: Years ago I went over to Scotland, and, if you ask me what I gained by staying quite a long time there, I would tell you very plainly that I don't know. If you press the question, I would say, "Well, after all, you know, the Scotch, why, they are just people like you or myself." But, before going to Scotland, I thought the Scotch were exceedingly different from the kind of men they are. My opinion now is that the Scotch are people just like you and myself and I believe that those French girls, after a time, after learning the difficult American lesson which you are giving them, will arrive at the conclusion that man is man and woman is woman; there are accidents and incidents but human nature is identical to itself through time, ages and place.

If you wish me to give you another example, if you ask me to tell you exactly how this American influence on the French University mind is going to work, I beg to refer you to an article which I read yesterday in a French review entitled, "The New France," of which copies will be found at the University Club. This article was published in December, 1919, and has been written by one of our best specialists, Professor Charles Diehl, an expert on history. If you will read that article, you will see that this great scholar has drawn every one of his arguments from his American experience, and from his knowledge of American Universities and Colleges. I refer you to that article.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am acting in this country as the representative of the only University association

there is in France. We call it the National Office of Universities and Schools. In many ways this association or bureau is like your various associations. We do combine with the French Department of Education. We have received the fullest possible official recognition from the Ministry of Education but we do not belong officially to it. Somehow, a public department or a minister of public education is just like a set of very fine volumes bound in red cloth on the top of your library book stand; they are very fine volumes, indeed, but there is a lot of dust on them.

Our Association was created in 1910, or sometime about that date. Every one of the members of our Association is a typical University man. If we know something about international politics, we know it from the historical standpoint; if we know something about international economics, we know it from the theoretical standpoint; but, one and all, we are backed by a long tradition, a tradition which started in the 12th century,—a tradition out of which grew another Alma Mater of mine, Oxford,—a tradition which it is up to us to keep pure and intact.

When I was appointed in November and sent over to this country as a university man, pure and simple, to act as a link between American and French Universities, the main obstacle I had to face was the fact that most of the people here did not know of my presence. So some weeks ago I had a little notice sent to various colleges in America,—simply a list of the French universities,—with my own name at the bottom of it. Maybe you have received it. I remember showing that notice to a friend of mine and he said: "Come on, you are doing propaganda again." I said: "Propaganda? I hadn't thought of that." Well gentlemen, that is the only notice you will ever get from me; take my word for it.

Let me tell you that, not so long ago, but in a place altogether different from this one, I received an order from a certain colonel whom I will call Colonel A. He

said: "Take this to Colonel B." So, down I went to Colonel B. I said, "Colonel, here is a letter for you." He said: "Colonel A, what do you mean? Don't you know that he wants to 'rate me'?" I saluted and quietly waited for a better answer that came in due time. When I reported to Colonel A, he said: "Is this the answer of Colonel B, the silly old fool?" I said: "Excuse me, sir, I didn't know anything about that." You may see that there are immense difficulties attached to the duties of an agent of liaison, and, as an agent of liaison, I may get cursed both by you and by my own people, I stand half way between and I may be punched right and left. I can't defend myself, I am but a servant. But when I got into this hall I said to myself: "This hall to me represents the American system of education. I notice there are many doors here, and I know *there are* doors and I know there are people inside and I know there are little compartments but I don't want to know anything about the little compartments; I am working with you all; I am at the disposal of one and all when it comes to be of any service.

I don't want, one fine day, to get a slap in the face for something that I am not responsible for. I am working in perfect harmony with everybody. I am always ready to do anything I can and as well as I can. Just give me credit for doing my best.

From you, I have received remarkable proofs of that spirit of good will that should be our guiding inspiration. For instance, last month, I had to face a very bad problem. Dr. Duggan, of the Institute of International Education, could tell you the nature of that trouble and the question before us was whether and how we should keep in this country French scholars sent over by the A. E. F. I submitted my difficulties to Dr. Duggan and Dr. Duggan came to the rescue in a practical way and solved the problem for me, and I thank him for it.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to present my most heartfelt thanks to all of you here and to you, Mr. Chairman, and also to your guests present at this conference.

In proceeding with my work I shall always bear in mind that it is the kind of work for which I have prepared and fought for the last twenty years.

Indeed, we have chosen and selected a great task. I don't know whether I shall fail or succeed, but my hat is in the ring. Whether I fail or not depends, of course, upon me. It also depends upon you. But in any case, we must remember, although some of you will object to the word, that university men belong, all the world over, to a "caste," the caste of leaders; that our responsibility is very great and that, in anything we do, we have to be free from the wind that blows. Let us guard ourselves against the brewing storm; let us watch carefully and jealously over the independence of our minds. I know you are conscious of your own responsibility. Let me tell you plainly, that as one who had the honor to act as a military instructor in the American army, I am exceedingly conscious of my own responsibility.

I am sorry for taking up so much of your time but really there were things which it was essential to say.

VIII. Arthur Percival Newton, the Universities Bureau of the British Empire and the University of London.*

One feels really a sense of humility in coming to stand upon a platform to say a few words after what your President has said to you and I think the best thing I can do is merely to thank him for his appreciation of anything that we in Great Britain have been able to do and to proceed with that task that we are all of us here to further, the task of helping on the intellectual accord not merely between the peoples of the English speaking race, but also between the other peoples of the world, and in what I am saying this morning I am not going to say anything merely from a purely English point of view.

*It was impossible to submit the stenographic report of Mr. Newton's remarks to him for editing.

The Universities Bureau of the British Empire merely represents what it pretends to do by its title. In 1910 and 1911 it was felt that there were a great many subjects which were of common interest to the fifty-seven universities and colleges of higher education that were in various parts of the empire, not merely in Great Britain but also in the dominions, and in India. It was desired to assemble a conference of representatives of those institutions to talk over these common matters and that conference was assembled in the early part of 1912. Representatives from all of the fifty-seven institutions attended and an extraordinarily important venture was embarked upon in consequence of that conference by setting up an office in London where information might be conveyed from one university to another about matters of common interest, where there might be a general clearing house for all matters that were desired to be known about by the various institutions.

Unfortunately, coming immediately after the setting up of that bureau, we had the war, when its activities were, to a considerable extent, lessened. But within the last two years of the war, very, very largely indeed, with the aid of the American representative in London who was in all our Councils, Professor Nettleton, and of Dr. Duggan, who is one of us in this matter, the Universities Bureau has embarked upon a fresh course of activity with largely increased means. In our house we have a common meeting ground for students from all parts of the empire, where a library of information concerning all the English speaking peoples of the world will be gathered together, with a bureau for information concerning other countries, and work is being done to tie together all the threads relating to this international work, and to keep us all fully informed about what one another is doing. Now, in pursuit of the work of the Universities Bureau, we are very, very glad to know that there is some order coming out of the comparative chaos, if you will permit me to say so, of the number of organizations which have been dealing with this flow of students across the Atlantic from the other side. We feel that with

the agreement that Dr. Capen has told you of between the American Council of Education and the Institution of International Relations and the American University Union in Europe, we have an organization with which we can deal in all matters relating to the exchange of students and professors.

Of course, we have in England another side of that work going on in the Rhodes Scholarship System whereby during the last fourteen or fifteen years you have had scholars from all the states in the Union working at Oxford. And, may I say this? Mr. Aydelotte, perhaps, could not say it, being an American: That the presence of the American Rhodes Scholars in Oxford has been of the greatest possible value to the intellectual world in England. Our young men come into contact informally with the leaders of American thought, not only with those men who say pleasant things at public dinners, but they come into contact with the young men from all the states of the Union who really do know the thing from the inside. The intercommunication between those men, and their studies around the fire produce a very, very great impression indeed upon our young Englishmen, and not merely upon the men who come from England but the men who come from Canada and Australia, whom you also find in the University at the same time.

Now, in the newer universities, which have not the advantage of those scholarships, we think it is our greatest task in the future to forward the graduate studies. We do not wish for very much flow of undergraduates to take place. The flow of graduate students to our universities we desire to further by every means in our power.

At the desire of the people from the overseas dominions, the British universities have embarked upon a plan of setting up a research degree of Ph. D. which shall be given after a minimum training of a two-year period of research work. For that it will be research that will be required; it will be actual work in the laboratory and the archives of the library in which the student will be expected to extend

the general bounds of human knowledge. The Ph. D. will be expected to be open to our own students on the same terms as it is open to Americans or to people from any part of the world. Comparatively large numbers of people will be working for it in each of these universities.

The British universities have decided in concert to remove practically all tuition fees for this research work. The research fee will be something like ten or twelve pounds a year, fifty to sixty dollars. That will cover any necessary tuition and any necessary university expenses that must be incurred but, naturally speaking, it will not cover the expenses of board.

We hope that a large number of scholarships will be provided, whether from American capital or from capital gathered in the countries to which the students come, whereby the system of prevailing fellowships will be very, very much expanded and whereby it may be possible for any brilliant student, after having graduated with distinction from his own university to look forward to a year of travel, or more than that, perhaps two or three years of travel, in countries other than his own in order that he may get that insight into conditions under which other peoples live and that he may come into contact with scholars in other lands, and therefore may further his value to his own country when he returns to it.

It seems to me that one of the most important tasks of us university people at the present time is to further the establishment of those prevailing fellowships for students of an advanced kind who have proved themselves to possess ability capable of dealing with conditions different from their own. It is not necessary for us to establish those prevailing fellowships as a reward and as a mark of distinction to those students who show themselves to stand out from their fellows and who will be the leaders of the future. If those students do flow in either direction across the Atlantic, across the Pacific, across the Indian Ocean, if we have this ebb and flow from all directions, I am sure we will do a very great deal to further the intellectual accom-

plishments of people. That is our desire in England and I can say also in Canada too; it is the desire of the intellectual world in Canada and I have no doubt, in meeting our Australian friends, that it is exactly the same there.

Throughout the whole of the realms that owe allegiance to a greater or less degree to the monarch who sits upon the British throne, there is a desire to further our intellectual efforts by every possible means in our power, and I hope that associations like the Association of American Colleges will continue their great work by endeavoring to further it by every means in their power.

IX. K. J. Saunders, Emanuel College of Cambridge University.*

I would not venture to speak to you even for five minutes except that I have been invited to do so and that I do represent some 320,000,000 people reaching out into a new era of democracy.

Three generations ago, exactly, the British government introduced into India higher English education and that has meant naturally that ideas of self government have been permeating the higher reaches, even the lower reaches of the people.

Today, as we sit here, the Indian people are looking forward eagerly within this next generation to attaining self government. Some of you have probably seen the report of Sir Michael Sedelau's commission, 2,000 pages, dealing with one Indian University only, the University of Calcutta. There the problem very briefly is stated in these words by a friend of mine, the principal of an Indian college. He says practically this: "In these first 2,000 pages, India is being reborn; education is nothing less than a high explosive for growing nationalities. We are in India, playing about with this high explosive as though it were a penny fire works.

The history of education in India may be written al-

*It was impossible to submit the stenographic report of Mr. Saunders' remarks to him for editing.

most in the lives of a few great Scotch missionaries, and those leaders in Indian education have been seconded by educationalists whom you have sent over through your great missionary societies.

But the result, as it has worked out, has been not wholly good. We have what is called in India a very top-heavy pyramid; great emphasis upon higher education, and not very much done amongst the primary schools.

The problem, therefore, is a very complex one and I want to suggest two or three principles here. The first is that the great missionary societies, to which the British Government looks with increasing confidence to help them in this vast problem of democratic education, must contribute less and less quantitatively and more and more qualitatively; that is to say they cannot hope to cover the whole field; that clearly is the task of the government, but their problem will be to put in quality of a really vital and significant kind; and I believe there you should look rather to sending out the younger type of professor than the callow student such as we have been recruiting almost by the hundreds. I think you ought to help us by strengthening the headquarters staff in India.

Now this problem has been enormously complicated by the fact that under the Montague-Williams report, the new form of democratic government, one of the subjects to be controlled entirely by Indian leaders is education. We have great men like the Vice Chancellor, known all over the world in higher mathematics; we have great professors of science; we have philosophers and the organizers of the Service of India Society. But the Indians are not at present able to control this great question of educating over 300,000,000 people without the very best kind of help that you and the universities of the rest of the British commonwealth outside of India can supply. And so I want you to think of it as a task of helping the youngest democracy in the world to find its way in the chaos of modern transition in India.

In India we have all sorts of formations going on,

people pouring out of the old agricultural life of 3,000 years into the greater cities; trade unions being rapidly formed; all kinds of ferment in the intellectual, religious and political life.

And I would suggest that there is no greater or more majestic task for the church, and for universities as a whole, to face than this task of providing the leadership for this ancient nation, which, in the providence of God, has, by a young nation from the West, been set upon its feet in this great new day.

I think you know that at this moment there is a commission studying the question of primary education. We in the missionary societies feel that what we can do, at any rate, is this: We can demonstrate the kind of education which so long ago General Armstrong demonstrated at Hampton. We feel that we can face the problem, first of all, of the great mass pouring into the Christian church; every week in India some 15,000 people are baptized. They come very often from classes which, by becoming Christian, have to give up their education. They have been cattle raiders or professional thieves. And so that commission is studying the question and we earnestly want your help; we want you to send out the kind of men you are training in agriculture. I think of one man who, because of his knowledge of agriculture, has introduced 500 plows in his immediate neighborhood, plows which cut into the subsoil. Remember we have a million returned soldiers who have seen things in France and other countries who are going back seething with new ideas, and these people are asking for a general system of primary education. And, lastly, there are some defects which only, I believe, the missionary society can correct.

The great problem is to get educators who look upon their task not as a profession but as a vocation. They have said to England, "Can't you get us men who will come out here and who will live amongst us and love their students because they are pioneers?" Today we need men of imagination, of keen sympathy, of democratic ideals, all over India.

When I went to my task I consulted a great missionary about it and he had the audacity to say this to me, "When your students come into your study, make them take off their shoes. Never let them sit in your presence." Now, gentlemen, the day of that kind of thing is, thank God, past. We must have men who will come in the spirit of partnership and not in the spirit of patronage.

But there are vast problems to be solved. The problem of an adequately trained Indian staff is a very vital problem. Only about 30 per cent of our teachers are adequately trained. The problem of a higher standard; we must constantly push the standard of education higher. The problem of the students who come pouring into these western lands. With you, in your colleges, let me plead for real hospitality, for real sympathy for these students from India. May I ask for more scholarships, for them, in order that they may come here and drink in your great American idealism, and they will give you, I am sure, a spiritual intensity and a new vision of what India has to contribute to this great world.

May I also plead for an interchange of professorships. It seems to me when a man has been four or five years in India he has a great contribution to make here. He needs stimulating, mentally and physically. Can't we arrange an interchange of professorships in these great universities?

And lastly, may I ask that you may, in the universities of North America, be keeping your eyes open for just the kind of young professor, a promising student, to do a task which is almost ignored and which is of vital importance, the great task of what I call popular education?

Then, in India today, the war has completely overturned many of her accepted traditions. She is looking to Christianity, just as we should, saying, "Is this thing which we are beginning to believe true or untrue?" And in the whole of India we haven't got a single newspaper interpreting current events to the people of the land.

We want also weekly papers like the New Republic, of high standard. The government is asking for co-opera-

tion in this new task of popular education through the press. And so here is a challenge which I am very grateful indeed for the opportunity of throwing down and I can assure you that Americans are very heartily welcomed in India by the government, by the church and by the great masses of the people, who have learned in their contact with them to respect them and to honor them for all those things for which they stand:

X. Bruno Roselli, the Italian Department of Education.*

It was with real surprise that on arriving in Chicago this afternoon several hours late, I found a telegram with instructions from His Excellency, Baron Camillo Romano Avezana, the Italian ambassador at Washington. All arrangements regarding my participation in this distinguished gathering having already been completed, I feared for a moment that these new telegraphic directions might be explained by some change of mind or of heart affecting the purport or the wording of the message which the Italian government wishes me to deliver today. On the contrary, I am glad to say that the telegram emphasizes the importance which the Ambassador desires to place upon both the message itself and the occasion of its delivery—the message informal and frank, as is made possible by my somewhat loose connection with the Italian Department of Education; the occasion a most auspicious one, a nation-wide gathering of American educators at a time when educated America is infinitely more eager to learn of Italy's intellectual life than she was before the War. May I be allowed to read the English translation of His Excellency's telegram?

"You will be kind enough to transmit to the educators in Chicago my personal greeting, explaining to them as fully as circumstances will allow how deep an interest our country feels in the development of the vigorous life of American colleges and universities. Be sure to formulate the desire that Italian and American scholars may engage in deeper

*"The International Status of Italian Education at the Close of the War."

and more frequent mental interchanges, because a true friendship among nations cannot fail if it rests upon the mutual knowledge of thoughtful and cultured people."

Such words appear to me to reflect just the kind of feelings which would be not only personally entertained, but also instilled into others, by a man of the mental caliber of the recently arrived Italian ambassador to the United States. We and you, for too long a period satisfied with second-hand information about each other, and relying upon obsolete, confused, or biased reports, must surely establish our direct relations on an intellectual basis if we are to establish them at all. For too long a time the living links of connection between America and Italy have been of two kinds, not bad in themselves, but inadequate because not at all descriptive of the mentalities of Italy and of the United States. Let us consider both these elements in detail.

On the one hand, the American visitors to Italy can hardly be said to have supplied a fair representation of the best which America has to offer. They belonged to three categories. The first was made up of quickly traveling school teachers, who tried to spend as well as they could the ninety days of their summer vacation by seeing as many countries as could be crowded into the time, occasionally six or seven or even eight in the brief space of one summer. Such visitors are, of necessity, superficial.

The second type of American traveler in Italy has been represented by the nominally well educated but extremely superficial society butterfly, the lady with a finishing school education who went from one to the other of the great summer or winter resorts of Southern Europe knowing enough languages to struggle with customs agents and railroad porters, but who, stopping before Italy's numberless statues of Garibaldi or of Victor Emanuel or of Mazzini, would wonder what kind of men these statues might possibly represent.

And the third type has been supplied by the business men who arrived in great haste in order to accompany home the members of his family who had spent probably an entire season at Taormina or Capri; but he, having very little time

at his disposal for the entire trip, and fretting constantly about train connections and steamer sailings, would only stop about two or three anxious and restless days, and would be, at any rate, too worn out by the fatigue of his eastward voyage and the plan of its westward replica to be really able to appreciate or to understand much about the "genius loci" of Italy. In many cases these people would have some knowledge as to the real or supposed character traits of the Italians, and would have heard of Raphael, Savonarola, and the Doges of Venice, but they would hardly know anything about our history of today,—surely nothing about Italy's contemporary life and thought.

Now, the Italy of today is certainly marking a deep furrow in the field of civilization. She is even accused, by envious pseudo-friends, of indulging in a programme aggressive in its daring:—iconoclastic in art, futuristic in literature, imperialistic in politics. The last of these accusations, indeed, has become a daily sport for some citizens of lands already possessing empires and therefore able to dignify their own ambitions by the name of *imperial* instead of *imperialistic*. Whether that last named accusation is right or wrong it is not for me to discuss, for I am not here for a political address but merely as an educator sent to this gathering of teachers to describe cultural conditions. And anybody who has been following the career of a Marconi, the inventor of the wireless, of a Caproni, the father of giant aeroplanes, of the "Fiat" Company, world leaders in automobile production; or of the one thousand and one inventions and initiatives created or perfected under stress of war necessity and now transformed into necessities of peace,—must recognize that there is in our new Italy an indescribable leaven at work which, most perceptible in the mother-land, does not appear to have as yet become merchandise for export; a daringly modern spirit which we do not find at all conspicuous in the other category of persons hitherto responsible for the mental inter-relation between Italy and America: that is, the Italians in the United States.

In discussing this second element, I must begin by making it clear that the preceding statement is not to be construed as a reflection upon the qualities of these rugged pioneers. My fellow countrymen here are more than useful, they are essential to the welfare of the United States; for the other racial currents of America have generally progressed beyond the ways of humble toil for a daily reward, and they no longer stoop to the kind of work that would soil their hands; and, therefore, if you will have railroads uniting the Atlantic and the Pacific, if you will have able-bodied men sweating on foundation and reclamation and consolidation work, if you will have builders of sky-scrapers and bridges and churches and palatial private dwellings, if you will have people digging in the subways of New York and of Boston and of other large cities of the United States,—you will find it unquestionably necessary to obtain in ever-increasing numbers those very sober, very adaptable and indefatigable workers, the toilers of “Sunny Italy”; but when all this is said and done, it cannot be admitted that such individuals constitute a fair representation of the *Third Italy*. They are wonderful in their own way, but they furnish a one-sided view of their native land to the average American who does not see—or, at least, who hardly ever sees—any Italians of any other variety, and wonders sometimes whether they exist at all. You would be surprised if you knew how often, during the years which I spent in this country, I have had people turn to me, and, after looking me over and listening to my imperfect but rather fluent English, remark “Are you an Italian, are you quite sure of it?” “Is it possible?” and so forth, with genuine astonishment, simply because of the fact that they are accustomed to connect the name of “Italian” with a mental and physical and social type considerably different from mine. They had created an artificial prototype, the *typical Italian*, whose traits were not to be recognized in me, and whose qualities did not correspond with the far from extraordinary qualities which I possess,—qualities which, I am willing to grant, are much more common on the other side of the

Ocean among the Italians living in Italy, than among those living in the United States.

And yet—make no mistake—they are a clear gain and no loss for you, those swarthy sons of toil, whose descendants are an invaluable addition to your American citizenship. Behold the second generation of Italians in this country. Do you not realize the unlimited possibilities of the children of the plain South-Italian immigrant who probably came here penniless and illiterate,—of that immigrant whose American-born child is therefore a better American, I dare state, than the scion of other nationalities which did not obtain from the New World the full measure of their opportunity? In my humble opinion, you need not be too deeply mortified at the sight of the Italian who does not wear a collar or necktie, for it is not his uncouth appearance but his sterling qualities of heart and his mental alertness which he will transmit to his children who are sure to be one hundred per-cent American,—a thing which you cannot always say of every other nationality. *We* do not have any foreign governesses to tutor our Italian children and instruct them in the languages and ways of the Old World! They will all go to your public schools; they will proceed from the beginning to the end along lines of American civilization, and you will not have to fear the hyphen there.

Do not forget that when America entered the War, the Italian element in America—both native and foreign born—responded to an extent that filled the authorities with amazement. Out of the four per cent which constitutes the Italian population in America, it gave nine per cent to the armed forces of the United States, and out of that nine per cent it wrote into the casualty lists of the United States Army and Navy an eleven per cent of all names. Why was that? Does it mean that the Italians were picked for slaughter? No. It means that the people who looked rather uncouth and whose work worn hands were not soft or smooth nor perhaps even clean, were not sent to Washington to pound on a typewriter, but were sent to France

to do the work that seemed after all to require hands not altogether clean, and that they acquitted themselves splendidly.

And yet, as you see, it is as *Americans*—either really or potentially—that we have to consider them; not as decisive liaison agents of our respective civilizations. I have been frank in my descriptions; let me be frank in my conclusions. There remains a long road to be covered before Italo-American mental relations have progressed as far as it is fitting and proper that they should; and in the present inadequacy of those mental relations is to be found the chief reason for so many regrettable misunderstandings in the aftermath of the War. It is highly regrettable, if I am to speak plainly, that the political discussions which have taken place during the last fourteen months should have necessitated or should have seemed to necessitate on the part of certain people the artificial creation of an anti-Italian undercurrent, and the deliberate distribution of misinformation with regard to Italian conditions, for the simple reason that these are notoriously the safest methods to achieve the aim in sight. And anybody can see that a better mutual knowledge would have frustrated those efforts, and blunted the venomous darts. Alas, those darts have sped far beyond the political aim for which they were intended, and have invaded a mental realm, poisoned a cultural field, impeded the progress if not actually endangered the continuity of our spiritual communion. Upon most unworthy shoals it is aimed by some politicians to wreck the good ship of inter-allied union—a union to which, incidentally, we have given in splendid holocaust no less than five hundred thousand lives. And now an antagonistic feeling has been created in certain quarters, in certain editorial sanctums, in certain cities and states—I know it perfectly well, for I have already spoken in one hundred and sixty-two American cities scattered over forty-one states—an unpleasant and almost unfriendly feeling which, of course, is going to remain long after the settlement of the Adriatic situation, as the light which proceeds from the comet con-

tinues to shine long after the comet itself has disappeared from view.

Obviously, the ideal way of explaining to the people of America the Italy that is, would have been to extend beyond the Alps which separate France from Italy, that wonderfully thick line of khaki-clad American soldiers who were sent so swiftly and so lavishly to the battle-fields of France; and I know that the gentleman* who was scheduled to speak this evening from this platform, and who instead, I believe, spoke here last night, was for a considerable time persuaded that he would be sent to the Italian battle-front with a large contingent of American soldiers. It is not for me to discuss the reasons which brought about an entire change of political orientation, resulting in the sending to Italy of only one regiment of American infantry. The fact remains that if not two million soldiers, or one million, but even half a million men in the American uniform had been sent to Italy, they would have returned as a solid mass of indirect propagandists of the Italy of today, as is proved by the attitude of the three thousand boys of the 332nd Infantry who were stationed there for several months. They came from the districts of Pittsburgh and of Cleveland; and whenever I travel in that section of the country addressing audiences of various types, I am so happy to have some of them come up to me practically every time, knowing that I was an Italian officer up to a few months ago, and say, "When we went to Italy, we did not realize what kind of a country it was, and now we wish we could see it better and could show it to our friends who do not understand anything about it."

I wish that the desire of those soldiers could really be granted. We of Italy stand in such desperate need of foreign understanding of all phases of our present life, that we feel like crying out to our neighbors the words that were addressed to the Greek philosopher by his pupil, "Strike, but listen." And Italy will not be the only one to

*General Leonard Wood.

profit by clearer understanding of her problems abroad. I beg to be allowed to prove it.

Let us concentrate, if you will, upon the educational issues. Italy's international educational status, in other words her post-war orientation in matters pertaining to civilization and culture, is one which is very, very important indeed now, on two grounds,—one, the geographical position of Italy, and the other, her present political position. In both cases, if she on the one hand needs the help of her new allies, on the other hand she can make these allies, these late partners in a common ordeal, profit immensely by a closer or at least a more even co-operation than there has seemed to exist since the days of the armistice.

Geographically and politically, I say. Let me make plain the first of those two specifications, which may at first appear rather strange. Why is it that the *geographical* position of Italy is becoming so important now? The cause is not obvious to the casual observer.

If Rudyard Kipling had known my Italy as well as he knows his India, I doubt whether he would have expressed in those familiar terms of utter helplessness the eternal contrast between Oriental and Occidental, "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." For "the twain" not only shall, but do meet in that unique land of mountain mists and semitropical sunshine, of near-Asiatic dreaminess and quasi-Teutonic practicality and positiveness, of capricious cypress and Gothic fir and whimsical grapevine and smiling orange, on the happy domains of that eternal Italy who, still pale and bleeding but confident that her wounds will not be fatal, has just replaced in the scabbard the Roman sword unsheathed in the defense of civilization, and now stretches out her blood-stained aristocratic hand to shake that of her partner beyond the seas who, also uncompelled and unchallenged, chose the crimson road of sacrifice as the only pathway consistent with national self-respect and international fellowship.

This geographical position is an element of paramount importance in discussing Italian events of these days.

For instance: To the superficial student of foreign affairs, who is, however, enough of a student to realize the utter unimportance of certain Adriatic towns, the intensity of feeling which occupies the hearts of millions of Italians when they discuss certain territorial rearrangements on the East appears inexplicable. Oceans of printers' ink, entire forests cut down as wood pulp for paper making purposes, days and days of cable transmission monopolized by Adriatic news, constant risks of international complications, seem to many of us so far away a high price to pay for the control of a second-rate seaport of 40,000 souls and of a sleepy little capital of 20,000.

But behind the fever heat of the Italian's passion lies the century-old tradition of the land which has been alternately Eastern and Western, has thrown her lot at last with the west, and is ready to risk her all to maintain her mental allegiance to Occidental forms of government and of society organization. An Italian who knows the United States from long and intimate contact, dares advance the suggestion that, if the nearest powerful Eastern neighbors of this country were situated forty instead of four thousand miles away, many Americans who now fail to understand Italy's position would do so in a flash. The prostrate but not lifeless body of that youthful Colossus, an Oriental Slavism, stretching from the Quarnero to the Yellow Sea, is as far from us in Italy as the Great Lakes Naval Station is from this hotel.

That Italy, once established within her just and safe frontiers, will do her work of intellectual liaison without any idea of forcible intellectual de-nationalization, is, I think, proved by her behaviour in the past. I wonder how many of the educators here present realize, for instance, that the Italian government maintains public schools in several foreign languages, so that the small non-Italic settlements scattered through a country otherwise remarkably homogeneous, may study in the tongues of their fathers: French in the Valley of Aosta, Greek in Sicily, Albanian in Southern Italy, and so forth, and thus perpetuate the picturesque traditions of their forefathers.

But in these days of sober counsel and thoughtful readjustment it behooves us to think of such a situation not in terms of picturesque travel and personal enjoyment, but in terms of deep human responsibility. I do not hesitate to say that in the present state of European affairs,—with a Teutonic world engulfed in a maelstrom which you may qualify as depth of penitence or as bitterness of defeat, and a Slavic world cut off from us by a tragic succession of events which you may gather together under the heading of social readjustment or of social experiment *in anima vili*,—we are confronted with a *de facto* situation which cannot be altered by the ravings of all the anti-Italian idealists now trying to establish a line of cleavage, nominally political, but in reality cultural and social, between Italy and her allies and associates. And this *de facto* situation may be summed up in a few words: From the mouth of the Scheldt to the city of Gorizia, fascinating meeting ground of three civilizations, the grim barrier is up, and Italy, only Italy, can keep open the mental as well as the physical route from the west to the east, from Britain to the Balkans, from the zone of the mother countries to that of the colonies, protectorates and mandates, from conservative Occidental Europe to the continent of tomorrow, Asia now fast opening up from Stamboul* to Kiaochau.

And yet this work, which is not of political, but of mental pacific penetration, cannot be done,—let me say it at the start,—by Italy alone. She cannot do it because her mental equipment, which from the standpoint of eclecticism is so unusually rich, is not endowed with the gift of a psychological internationalism; in other words, Italy is just as poor in the knowledge of *peoples* as she is rich in the knowledge of *things*. The mental processes and traits of other races and other populations, even of those nearest to her, the French, the Spaniards, the Germans, the British, are too often a *terra incognita* over which the tragi-comical inscription, “*hic sunt leones*” might be written by many an Italian who is otherwise so Leonardesque as to accomplish far more than dilettante work in four or five different branches of human learning.

The scientific habitat of the Italian mentality is both broad and deep; its geographical habitat is deep but not broad. In a brief search for examples, my mind goes back with considerable glee to the otherwise excellent Italian official who, when I made a tour of American universities to explain, as an officer of the Italian Army, the position of my country in the world war, sent me post haste from the University of Indiana to that of Texas and back to that of Ohio, because of a scientific division of the work which I am sure would have been appreciated more by a scholarly outsider than by this long suffering traveler who found himself compelled to add another three thousand miles to the one hundred thousand already covered in the fulfillment of his duty in America.

It would not be fair, of course, to consider this specific case as an axiom, or to draw corollaries from it. Nevertheless, the examples of this mental attitude are so many as to justify one statement on my part; that for a country situated in a geographical position of such risk and responsibility, Italy has too few sons who fully understand the import of such geographical mission; and therefore much of her usefulness to herself and to the rest of the world depends upon the *choice of her friends*. I find myself, therefore, already in the middle of the second point; the present political position of Italy with relation to education.

It is a universally acknowledged fact that the Italian educational systems had become pretty thoroughly Teutonized at the beginning of the world war, and I do not need to tell you how important it is (not only for the geographical reason which I gave before and which affects so many lands, but for reasons of the permanent good of the whole world, including countries only indirectly connected with Italy and committing now the same mistakes which we committed forty years ago) that we should at least put those educational methods on a par with educational methods of other countries, and reconsider the entire situation of higher education in Italy; reconsider, I say, not change over night in a fit of war-time hysteria, because we do not propose, for

instance, to tear up our wonderful German maps of the Ancient and Mediaeval world, or to destroy those beautiful Latin-Italian and Greek-Italian dictionaries which Teutonic patience and scholarship have given to us.

We do not propose to have a peace of venom. We do not propose to have a destruction of whatever is good and helpful, and free from the slightest suspicion of propaganda, in the educational world of Germany, in order to open up a new vista to Italian scholars; but we do propose to see at the same time that this vista shall be free from political mists. Surely if in this cultural arrangement the allied military brotherhood of yesterday, whose memory is so dear to us, will represent but a distant background, the late Triple Alliance which joined us politically with Germany will have no part at all. Just as a man of scholarly mind who wishes to master a certain topic does not look at publishers' names, or at the real or apparent nationality of the author, or at the place of printing, when he collects the material upon which his work will be carried on, so this new Italy intends to fling open to all nations the gate of opportunity; and the entire mass of information thus placed at the disposal of Italian scholars shall be reconsidered from the very start, from the very foundation, on the strength of actual importance, on the basis of actual merit. Whatever was fundamentally good in our text-books, dictionaries, and maps of German origin will remain, after being subjected to drastic and searching revision—and, above all, after successfully withstanding comparison with British and French and American material—a comparison in which not only depth, but flexibility, will count; and adoption previous to 1914 will, in doubtful cases, influence the judges rather unfavorably than favorably. Is this not an honest and sane program?

As to the objection of some pessimists that anything short of a program which will strongly savor of allied protectionism would mean the perpetuation of the influence of Germany in our schools, let me reply emphatically to those pessimists that they belittle the mental possibilities

of themselves and of their allies. We know perfectly well that the Germans have done admirable work studying, teaching and advertising the Italian language, literature and culture, but mainly because they saw the magnificent opportunity of exploiting that Italian educational world which, if we are to be frank, the French, the British and the Americans—through conservatism, political jealousy, or near-sightedness—had overlooked as a possibility. The inter-relation of politics and culture which I acknowledged and deplored at the beginning of my address was mainly responsible for the fact that there are many more Germans studying the Italian language in the universities of Germany than there are French, British and (emphatically, alas) American students of "l'idiomo gentile". But this is not going to continue when Germans realize that Italy will no longer be the hand-maiden of her private military club; and when the other great powers, discovering finally that Italy had become of age while they were asleep, shall hasten to make *amende honorable* for the slowness with which they discovered the fact.

We have entered now a period in the history of Italy when we have to stand on our own feet. For a long time our chief task had consisted in turning from one great power to another in order to obtain some kind of support; and that made us feel very humble indeed, and helped develop in us certain qualities of adaptability which we were finally able to supplant with those of energy when we became of age. It is hardly necessary to remind any one that this event took place on May twenty-third, 1915, when we threw our challenge to our century-old enemy, Austria; and although our war was but a chapter of the common struggle, yet the total disruption of that motley empire which took from Austria its name and its vital force, turned out—for a number of reasons too long to enumerate—to be an all-Italian undertaking. Greater, therefore, the elation of Italy over her victory; proportionally greater her dangers in a jealous world. Thus we were, and are, accused of not severing at once all the mental connections with Teuton-

ism, for Machiavellic reasons. History has proved that although we did not burn all our German text-books when going to war, we were not actuated in so doing by a desire to make merely a pretense to fight, but by our respect for learning, which would have suffered greatly if we had indulged in such spasmodic and child-like fits of excitement, unworthy of a race which has been on intimate terms with civilized history for no less than thirty centuries. For you can readjust a military and strategic situation overnight, perhaps, but you cannot readjust overnight the intellectual orientation of a country,—and the alternative (if you insist on acting hastily and hysterically) is mental stagnation until reconstruction after the war. I firmly believe that when all these political clouds have passed it will be found that we saw things in a patriotic yet broad-minded way in 1915; and so, while we proceeded toward the gradual de-Teutonization of our culture by systematic substitutions, other peoples who had indulged in a hasty “auto-da-fé” of everything even distantly German, are now beginning to retrace their steps with bashfulness, as well as lengthy and not always satisfactory explanations. Has not the moment come for us Italians to bid other people remember that they also are of age? For all humanity must realize that we are not dealing in terms of years, but in terms of centuries, when we endeavor to re-arrange the mentality of the world.

Indeed, we of Italy, now that our day has come, desire to see a two-fold recognition of our educational policies; one relating to depth and one to wisdom. Of the latter I have just spoken. As to the former, we can only quote the *vox clemantis in deserto* of many a foreign scholar who discovered us—usually by chance. Is it not time to bring about an influx of students to Italy from other countries, the kind of advanced American scholars, for instance, which has hitherto been studying in the universities of Germany and of England, and which is beginning now to study in the universities of France; people who should tomorrow add the glory of a *natio Americana* to those ancient universities of the Peninsula which endowed a reborn world with the

first taste and the first idea of learning, to Padua, to Salerno, to Pavia, to Bologna, and so many other shrines of Mediæval and early Renaissance learning?

I do not need to tell you how insignificant is the number of foreign students in Italian universities at present; and yet it may interest you to know that the United States is the least represented there among great powers. But something is already being done to remedy this state of affairs; and I am sorry that I was not present this morning to hear the message of Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, and of the other gentlemen who represent the ideas of a broader and deeper interchange of mental relations between Europe and America, because I should have liked very much to hear confirmed by men like Dr. Duggan (with whom I had a long conference on these and kindred subjects some days ago in New York) that Italy is taking her place on an even basis with the other great powers in the coming interchanges of students and of teachers.

It may be characterized as typical of the present anomalous situation that the first two Italian exchange professors in America are both men who have had a longer and closer college and university experience in other lands than in Italy. Probably our native country did not intentionally choose men in this situation; but practical adaptability had been insisted upon, and it is fair to assume that the average Italian scholar and educator, no matter how wonderful a teacher, might find himself out of place in an American college or university. Now I, for one, much as I relish my position of undeserved honor, wish to see the day close at hand when Italy and the United States will be so much nearer educationally that the choice may be based merely upon a strict foundation of scholarly attainments. We want to be able to send from Italy to America, or from America to Italy, people who will find themselves "at home", and not educationally lost, in countries so hospitable that the feeling of strangeness and unfamiliarity must of necessity be traced to the distance between the roads which led teachers and students to learning; for the nature of the

welcome extended to the visiting professors would surely militate against any such feeling.

I know from the exchanges of views I had with educators in Italy as long as six years ago when I first took up—timorously enough!—the matter of exchange professorships, that they did not understand at all what was meant by it; nor did they understand the idea of exchanges of students. They are beginning now to learn; and I am sure that, although inarticulate as every Italian is in things international, they mean to express satisfaction over the success of the first attempts. They are now looking, unquestionably, for further light and encouragement; because although Italy *can* do things, yet she has the diffidence of old people and old nations for anything new and untried. When it comes to doing something entirely different from custom, quite novel, and, I might say, semi-revolutionary,—yet without that light of romance which would immediately recommend it to Italians—they will look to you to make the initial moves. It is the new country, it is the new continent which must start and lead; Italy will be sure to follow along the lines which are marked out to her by the practical experience of a most practical people.

Men like Dr. Duggan, men like Dr. Stokes, and others who have had this idea of international co-operation along educational lines paramount in their minds for years, will unquestionably be followed by the Italians who, while admitting that their country must not be expected to take the leadership at the starting point (for she is too conservative and will probably keep on presenting objections valid enough but not out-weighing the advantages) will be glad when a "revolutionary" American mind will conclusively show to them the latent possibilities underlying these exchanges. From that moment on Italy will no longer fail to follow, and you will have an uninterrupted succession of exchanges, both of teachers and of students.

Why? Because of the very conservatism of Italy, who, when once she has adopted a certain measure or custom, is likely to persevere until dissuaded by most com-

elling reasons. So in the readjustment of her mental equipment, Italy shall look upon America for advice and leadership, upon an America whom she is just beginning to discover, with genuine amazement mixed with admiration. For had Italy not been told all along that America was nothing but a mentally abnormal dollar worshipper, living on figures and freaks? An incredible thing, indeed, what nonsense and what slander has been transmitted back and forth from the United States to Italy since the Atlantic cable was laid. Doubtless many of you remember the kind of information which you obtained while traveling in Europe, and especially in Italy, regarding what was happening in your country. Such news is hardly ever descriptive of the best things or of the most important events which take place in the United States; it is perversely inclined to specialize on colossal labor strikes, grewsome lynchings, railroad accidents, family scandals, and the terrific cost of the latest necklace which Mr. A. presented to Mrs. A., with clear innuendos as to its being intended for Mrs. B. It is always the theatrical thing which the European public was trained to expect concerning American news; the crux of the whole matter, I am told, is to be found in the fact that cable tolls are high, and therefore only sensational news can justify the expense of telegraphic transmission from America to Europe. And courtesy prevents my criticizing more than with a passing word the quality and quantity of Italian news appearing in the press of the United States.

But let me discuss our own Italian shortcomings. How does it happen that, while your language is fairly well known in Italy, your civilization is not? Briefly, it is because your language and your civilization do not belong to each other in the same sense in which the French language and civilization, or the Italian language and civilization, belong to each other. Usually, when we study a certain language, we study the civilization that grows with that language; thus, when you study French, you take pains to study France. And so it happens that when an Italian studies English, he studies *England*—and there he stops.

There is, as yet, no separate United States language, whose study would bring with it unavoidably a study of the United States. So that the mental propaganda of your civilization, having no vehicle of its own, finds it harder to travel through new paths than that of any other great and independent civilization.

And yet, how generously the student of America finds himself rewarded for his labors! How fascinating and inspiring, for one who expects to find merely a slight variation from the British theme, to see unfolded before him a totally independent civilization, which is purely English only in the means of transmission! And—which is the point I am most anxious to make—how happily does the Italian who studies your mentality, discover that you have based your civilization upon many others, culling from here and there without prejudice and without clannishness, according to the method which seemed to lead to greater and more permanent national profit!

For this—this and no other—has been *our own* educational policy since the War: eclecticism plus patriotism. No educator worthy of the name, no descendant of the Romans who owed a large share of their popularity as rulers of the ancient world to the then novel theory that victory must not be accompanied by revenge, would advocate in these hybrid days in which the mentalities of war and of peace overlap and intermingle, an educational policy in which no part was given to the culture of our enemy of yesterday. But I must add with pride that Italy no longer countenances that Teutonic preponderance in her educational institutions which was a far-seeing element of the German scheme of world empire. Educationally as well as commercially, Italy stands as an open field today, with equal opportunities for all. And yet, let it be clearly understood that although the field be closed to none, the paths marked across it by the friendly armies, by the charitable institutions, by the ambulances and the Red Cross trains of our allies will be kept especially open for them, that they may use them in the days of peace as they did use them

in the days of war. We Romans, children of the road makers of the past, have not forgotten the lesson learned from our forefathers; that roads built for Mars can and should be used by Mercury and Minerva. It may be true that *all* roads lead to Rome, but we shall personally see that the road which saw the triumphal progress of your Star Spangled Banner into the Eternal City is kept in a condition worthy of the unforgettable event.

THE RELIGIOUS IMPULSE IN EDUCATION

President Lynn Harold Hough, Northwestern University

The matter of relating education and religion in some sound and productive fashion is, I think, easily the most difficult and tantalizing problem which confronts the temporary educator.

In the first place it is extremely difficult to find anything even approaching an opinion as to what we mean by religious impulse. Not very long ago in a certain institution of light in America a brilliant writer was saying in one of the periodicals of the institution that the time had at length come to relieve religion of all that handicap which came from connecting it with any such mediaeval thought as the personality of God, for instance, to make religion what it is, a vigorous and a hearty idealism which is furthering the cause of human brotherhood and let it go at that.

Well, if we can all agree that the best place to begin is there, that is at least one place to begin but I am afraid the problem is not quite so simple as that for if I read the signs of the times correctly that kind of beautiful idealism which expresses itself in the dream of brotherhood is itself just about to have to fight for its life.

The pre-supposition of our immediate past that nobody could question was the social impulse. But I think it is perfectly clear that we are just on the edge of a time when an enthusiastic prophetic interpretation of the

belief that self realization is the great thing in life is going to attack the very fundamental emphasis on brotherhood so that we are going to find the social passion itself is the thing which will not be taken for granted within ten or fifteen years.

Now, when these things are true they merely illustrate the extreme difficulties which confront those which are attempting to relate truth and some connection with functioning reality to the life of growing men and women as they come into our institutions of learning.

What is the thing we can do practically and what is the danger if we do not do this thing? What is the nature of the crisis if there is a crisis and what can we do?

Well, of course, there are a number of ways of approaching a problem of this kind. Perhaps the simplest way is the way very emphatically illustrated by Mr. Benjamin Kidd's book on the "Science of Power," which is an endeavor to show that unless you have the propulsion of some great and noble idealisms working themselves out into a functionate strength of brotherhood, life itself becomes impossible; the structure of life begins to fall apart; human relationships begin to disintegrate.

It might seem, for instance, that the war has helped to teach us that lesson. I fancy we must approach the latter although I fear it will take a little courage on the part of educators to do it in just this way. I fancy we must approach the whole matter by a frank facing of the issues involved in an educational theory and an educational practice which are built about the conception of efficient organization and over against an educational conception and an educational practice, built about the idea of richness and fulness of personal life.

You can take Oxford to represent one ideal and almost any university you might drop in upon except Jena, in a period immediately before the war, in Germany, as the other. It is perfectly easy to find fault with Oxford but when you have said all that, when you have gone away from a common room like that at Balliol, just scintillating with the vivid mental vigor of the life

and while admitting its limitations, you feel its tremendous and vital force.

When you have analyzed its life you feel that the typical Oxford man comes out of Oxford at last with a sort of glowing enthusiasm—covered by a surface of vivid cynicism, to be sure, but above it a sort of glowing enthusiasm for those things which he believes will enrich and enlarge the experience of life for himself and for other men. In other words, with all its follies Oxford has maintained the tradition of a productive human idealism, which has the very genius of religion in it.

Now, take any one of the institutions I would characterize as applying to the other ideal. What are the outstanding elements of their life? There are some very good elements. In the first place there is a wonderful enthusiasm for truth in the physical realm, a wonderful willingness to be candid, even when it is difficult, and you have to pay a price to be candid, a wonderful desire to trace the most furtive fact to its lair and classify it; to become a master of some particular field with a straightforward effectiveness which will leave nothing to add after the task is done. One cannot pay high tribute enough to the fashion in which a certain kind of superficial emotionalism has been reduced to vacuity and has its inner heart exhibited to the world.

And yet, sooner or later, this curious thing happens: Whenever you get a university which is simply busy in relation to its ideal about creating men who are masters of a particular field, thoroughly classified, and the laboratory possibilities of certain forces with which experiments have been conducted—whenever you get a university where that is the outstanding characteristic, you discover a strange thing: The strange thing is this, that as it gains in intellectual appreciation it decreases in the capacity to produce the creative mind. Of course that is the outstanding challenge that contemporary university life must face in any event; the creation of double entry bookkeepers of the mind rather than of minds

which have the capacity for initiative, for visualizing things in large and productive and unusual manner, a new capacity for casting themselves forth into that dim and mystic future which lies ahead and by the culture of the idealizing and synthetic faculty of helping to produce the very thing of which the mind dreams.

In the long run the necessity for giving the fundamental religious impulse a place in the university is simply that if you build about the conception of the world as a series of perfectly articulated actions without the vivid play of personality itself, you will have a class, a great company of third rate minds and men of inspired dullness, men of microscopic precision about microscopic and unimportant tasks, men who with infinite agility carry on the work of bookkeepers in the realm of the intellectual life but who have lost that resiliency, that initiative, that capacity to move out and possess the world, "to see life steadily and to see it whole."

Fundamentally the religious impulse is just this impulse, the impulse which believes that back of all forces, back of other relationships is this center of self-realization and self-protection and self-surrender and that the vivid and rich consciousness of personality so defined and the development of that consciousness into full functioning power is the highest task of education.

Now, I do not mean for a moment that I would go as far with this thing as Professor Stephen Leacock goes in the essay wherein he says that contemporary education has capitalized the second class mind, that contemporary biology is a study of what we do not know about life and contemporary economics is a study of what we do not know about the laws of wealth and contemporary medicine is a study of what we do not know about the body and contemporary theology is a study of the mistakes we have made about God; obviously that is running away with a contention which has a certain validity within carefully defined limits. But, after all, is it not true that all of us have reason to examine our own educational theories with a good deal of patient

scrutiny, when we come to ask ourselves how many men of original and resourceful minds we are sending out to function in the world and when we ask ourselves on the other hand how many men who wear perfectly proper little tailor made suits of the mind we are sending out? If we are willing to face the facts, isn't there a very, very large necessity for an anxious and close study of the thing we are doing.

Now, I believe that the fundamental matter, as I have said, is that an impersonal theory of education invariably works out in the type of mind which loses the capacity of initiative.

Of course, before the war the feeling of all this was abroad in Europe very vividly. Precisely that thing. Buyson, who had appeared in France, was like some cowboy with a belt of cartridges ready to shoot off a cartridge at the slightest provocation to prove that he could. If the war had not come we were just about at the place where we were beginning to realize that even as the middle ages produced an ecclesiastical theory which made men busy spinning out their own web, even as Protestantism produced a self conscious and infinitely dry scholasticism, that the scientific mind had entered upon its own period of dry scholasticism in a good many relationships.

Now, one does not mean by that an attack upon the scientific method or the large and accumulative results which have been brought to us by the application of that method. One simply means to insist that life is larger than the whole realm of mechanical relationships and that life is so large that you must keep that room for initiative, that room for play, that room for fresh and new, originating experience which you can only have if you have a theory about life built upon a personal conception of the work.

Now, all this may seem far from any particularly contemporary expression of religion. My answer, of course, to a criticism of that kind is that the university must begin a great ways off from any particularly contemporary expression of religion.

The university, of course, if it is wise, will not for a moment begin with the theological battles, it will begin with an insistence that life itself, life as a vivid, masculine tremendous experience has the right to cut its way through any settled sophistication and any strange articulation, through any mode of thought whatever, and that at last we must get a view of life big enough to allow all of life to function; and that means that you must allow for a richer functioning place for the idealistic aspect in all the practical views of life, than has been given by practically any contemporary method of education.

All these things are in a measure true with the student mind with which we have to deal. I think they will furnish us an illustration about the point of contact. There were multitudes of young college men in universities all over America before the war that had not had anything to do with anything to which you could apply the word religion who, when the demand was made, which was brought by the war, suddenly found themselves confronted by something other than themselves, vaster than themselves, to which they could give themselves with a sort of glowing surrender, and they entered into a perfectly mystical experience of what was called the religion of patriotism, and it swept many of them over the top in France and it swept many of them up in a chariot of fire, into the unseen regions beyond this life.

Now, the interesting thing about it was that these yearningly, whimsically lonely men who had had everything in the world except some vast thing to command their whole allegiance is that these men found that thing in the religion of patriotism.

And now that the war is over that is a very important matter, as they come back to our universities. A good many of them know perfectly well that the thing that happened to them in that experience was the biggest thing that ever happened to them. Can we give

them an equivalent of that high adventure in the terms of the idealism of peace? Can we give them an equivalent of that thrusting out of the personality in the name of the invisible command of something greater than a man's own life? So whether it is Emerson's "over soul," or something as great as the most mystical aspect of religion, the moment a man finds living in the world another than himself and vaster than himself, the moment he flings himself out, giving in the name of Him, that man begins to realize the full force of his personality as he never did before, and it seems perfectly clear that the immediate approach to the mind of our time, the mind of the eager leaders, the adolescent, red-blooded men who are coming into our institutions, the approach to that mind is the frank offer of something vaster than a man's own life, vaster than the range of his own experience, to which he will surrender himself in the same spirit and with the same obedience which our boys gave to the command of the country as they went into the war and built a human bridge across the three thousand miles of the Atlantic to the fields of France.

Now, one may ask in the last place, what is the relation of all this sort of thing with historic religion, and particularly with historic Christianity?

Well, of course, the moment, in the terms of any one of the great ethic religions, the moment a man discovers anywhere in the world something vaster than his own life, to which he gives himself so that all his powers are organized to service, whether it be an abstract ideal or a concrete personality, that moment he enters the realm of religion. With relation to Christianity, it ought to be perfectly clear that the intellectual seizure of Christianity upon our time must come just from the consciousness that structurally, whether we like it so or not, we are so made that we dry up into moral and spiritual and intellectual incapacity unless we have taken the venture in the name of an overmas-

tering spirit and that, after all, historically that adventure has never been guided so nobly—historically that adventure has never been an adventure upon which men have been launched with such great vividness of personal summons as in the name of that one personality of the wizardry of whose gentle love, and the glowing vision of whose personality even singing words of lyric music can not at all tell the tale, and only minds opened to the purposes of the high idealism and wills sets about the path of His radiant enthusiasm can build the world into a real consciousness of what it has been and may be once again.

And, after all, the last thing comes to just this: If you can get all the idealism of the universe passed through a burning glass in one white, searching flame, and you can get that flame blazing in a human heart, that will bring inspiration beyond the power of words to tell. And historically that, of course, is what the personality walking with regal tread through the four Gospels has done for the world, and, doing that, has gradually made men conscious of this last, noblest view of life. The university itself is on the side of that fire of personal idealism which has released itself upon the world through the influence of Jesus Christ.

Of course, these things must come up from within as a vital experience. They can not be forced from without. Of course, they thrive best in an atmosphere of perfect freedom, and whenever we try to coerce these subtler things of life they wither up and die. But one ventures to say that it is still true that even as in great universities in other days men paid the high price of the strange adventure of going on a long pilgrimage in the name of an invisible ideal, as they did, so must men do and die if the life of the world is to be renewed, so, once more, that personal, vivid consciousness of the other than myself which masters my life, first in the terms of a dim and unpalpable ideal, and at last in the terms of the most masterful personality the world has

known, will move out to take possession of open-minded, open-hearted men and women, who will take the great adventure. It will go in harmony with all the careful classifications of the mechanical sciences, and will do its work of keeping the splendor of personality itself alive in the world.

So at least I visualize the situation in our time. So we will create the atmosphere which will encourage adventurers in the realm of the spirit.

We really owe it, do we not, to the men and women who come within our walls?

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Samuel P. Capen

I presume that you are familiar with the scheme of organization of the American Council on Education, but perhaps I might allude to that by way of beginning.

The Council consists of three groups of members. First, the so-called constituent members, which are the great national associations, primarily those that deal with higher education. Of those there are sixteen that are now members of the Council. Practically all of the national associations dealing with the various aspects of higher education and also the N. E. A. are included among the constituent members.

There is also a group of associate members which consists for the most part of learned societies like the American Historical Association and the American-Scandinavian Foundation. There are some ten or a dozen of those. The expectation is that this list will be extended.

Then, in order to finance the body [I think it is only fair to make the frank statement], in order to finance the body which should represent the combined opinion of American higher education, a class of institutional members was created. All the colleges of the country were asked to join as institutional members

and to pay membership fees ranging from \$100 a year to \$500 a year, graduated according to the size of the institution.

By the first of November, 1919, the Council had raised a minimum budget pledged for five years of something over \$20,000. The budget has since that time grown through further subscriptions from institutions to about \$23,000 per year, pledged for five years. That enables the Council to maintain an office in Washington and to transport the principal committees connected with it; it enables it to do nothing else, as you can see.

Now, as to some of its projects, I said this morning that originally I believed the institutions felt it should deal largely with the international situation and that recent events made that more or less out of the question for the moment. There are, however, a number of domestic matters which, in my judgment, are very much more important to American higher education. These are peculiarly the sphere of the Council and these, I believe, you would like to hear about.

I think that first and most important of all just at present is the situation which is presented by pending federal legislation. I proposed to the Executive Committee just before I took office that the Council's first job should be to analyze, digest and interpret pending federal legislation affecting education and, on the basis of such an analysis, present to Congress a constructive policy for governmental participation in educational affairs. I had no idea at that time how large a thing was being contemplated. During the last month I have been engaged in making this analysis. There are now, as nearly as I can count, eighty-three educational bills before Congress. Some twenty or twenty-five of them involve very large questions of national policy which affect all higher education as well as other phases of education. For instance, there are some two or three large military bills which have educational features that touch the whole higher educational system. It looks

as if one of them would get through this session. Which one we can not say yet. There are a number of bills involving the creation of new departments, new boards, and a larger measure of federal control. Now these last-named measures, of course, will not affect colleges which are on private foundation directly. Indirectly they may have a very profound effect on those colleges. I believe that here is a task of first moment which up to date only this body can perform. We propose to get before you in a very short time this analysis of the existing situation and to be sure that nothing happens before congressional committees with reference to any of these larger matters without notification being given to the educational interests of what is intended.

I may add that we have established a standing committee on federal legislation, of which President McCracken of Lafayette is chairman, that is now considering these bills as they are being digested and that is finally to make a recommendation in the name of the Council.

In my brief remarks this morning I alluded to the desirability of bringing about a uniformity of procedure among the agencies that are defining college standards. There are seventy-two such agencies in the United States. Probably not over fifteen of them have any very wide influence. Fifteen or so do have very wide influence. No two or three are operating on identical criteria, although the measuring stick is very similar in each case to the other measuring sticks. But it is obvious that some sort of uniformity, if the thing is going to go forward at all, should be brought about in standardization. I can not see any other agency at the present time which is as well situated to bring that about as this body. The Council has undertaken to bring these agencies together. Steps have already been taken in this direction.

Personally I believe that the general problem of the liberal arts college is the most critical question in

American education today. I think the arts college is the one institution which pre-eminently needs a re-definition and a re-assertion of its place and purposes. It needs to have its relations to the different types of institutions that have grown up under it and around it and on top of it in the last twenty years defined and made clear. The Council has established a standing committee on the status and problems of the college of arts and sciences and we hope to secure support for what we trust will be a comprehensive and an authoritative report on this subject. It should be issued within a year or two.

There are several other projects, some of major and some of minor importance, but your president has said that this must be a very brief statement and I fear I have not been quite brief enough.

THE COLLEGE AND THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

I. President A. B. Storms, Baldwin-Wallace College.

As a company of college executives the subject presents itself primarily as involving questions of administrative policy. How far should college authorities undertake to prescribe what shall and what shall not be taught in the classroom and from the rostrum? What is the legitimate function of the college in face of the economic problems that confront us? Can the college furnish guidance and leadership in present perplexities, and should the college be expected to do so?

Such questions as these are not easily answered.

On the one hand are those who insist that the vitality of a college depends upon the courage and intelligence with which its members, especially its teaching members, face the issues of the hour. There must be the greatest possible freedom in the "academy," it is maintained, for there, more than anywhere else, opinions and theories should be tested out in discussion. Freed from the bias and pressure of immediate ma-

terial interest involved, where so appropriately as in the atmosphere of the college, can economic and industrial questions be considered on their merits, and answers be found that rest on sound economic principles?

Moreover, does not the college owe to society such expert assistance as it can give, such intelligent guidance as it should be able to furnish? Is it not for such purpose the colleges have been founded and endowed? Perplexities constitute a challenge, not an excuse.

On the other hand are those who contend that the college has been established, at least in most cases, to conserve and foster and promulgate "sound doctrine," whether in religion or in economics, and that fidelity to the founders and supporters demands that these institutions be conservative, that they furnish safe counsel, and that they send forth defenders of the faith, rather than knights errant in the interest of the new and the untested.

Boards of trustees are not usually made of radical or dangerous men. Substantial citizens are not usually of the stuff of which revolutionists are made. Benevolent men who have made large profit out of the existing order, and who contribute to the endowment of colleges, are not likely to favor radicalism in college faculties. And while college executives are proverbially broad-minded and able to sympathize with many different and conflicting views, caution becomes second nature. A college executive who is spoiling for a fight in the field of economic and controversial issues will probably not be burdened for long with executive responsibilities. The college executive and his board of trustees may be quite patient with a radical professor, but it must be clearly understood that it is the tolerance of a superior and paternal wisdom. The general impression must be sustained that the college is "safe."

Let us say first of all, in quest of guiding principles, that college instruction should be scientific, open-

minded, honest. The college is no place for the reckless iconoclast, nor for the unprogressive, dogmatic reactionary. Economics is a science. As such there are some established principles that can not sanely be questioned. Economic theories have been promulgated and tested out as to their logical consistence, if not in the actual field of practice. Economic science has an historical background. To make students intelligent about that background familiarize them with economic development. As in religion, so in economics, many heresies have sprung up and been laid low and ought never again to trouble the world. At any rate, students ought to be able to identify easily the heretical germs that breed pestilence and that have been isolated and tagged. To be forewarned is to be forearmed. And out from our colleges should go social physicians who can and who will guard society against economic pestilence.

We want men, then, in our chairs of economics who are well educated themselves in the history of their own subject. That which is new and untried and therefore dangerous should be recognized as new and welcomed to the laboratory of economic science in the college. Subjected to analysis and studied in the light of history, which is systematized experience, that which seems new may after all prove old, and either be approved as sound or disapproved as unsound. A professor of economics who should, for example, advocate fiat money as a safe financial policy for a government to pursue would be dismissed from any college faculty. History as well as the recognized and established laws of economics are against him. But a professor who hesitated to let into his classroom discussion any form of fiat theory that might be engaging the interest and attention of society and subject it to analysis and judgment as to the economic principles involved, would likewise be unfit for his place as teacher. The teacher must meet the responsibility of facing social as well as economic facts, and of forming judgment of approval and of condemnation.

In the second place, then, let us say that the science of economics is vital and we must have vital men teaching it. Every human interest has its economic aspects. Bogart, who thought it timely to write an "Economic History of the United States," has this to say in his introduction:

"The keynote of all American history, from whatever standpoint it may be written, is found in the efforts of a virile and energetic people to appropriate and develop the wonderful natural resources of a new continent and there to realize their ideals of liberty and government. The economic history of the United States," he adds, "is largely the story of the achievements of a people working under free competition, untrammelled by custom, tradition or political limitations, and whose changing conditions of environment constantly compelled new adaptations and promoted ingenuity and energy of character. The history of this economic struggle is not one whit less interesting or dramatic than the political history of the same period, while it is absolutely essential to the understanding of the latter."

The teacher of economics should be a man of broad knowledge, thorough culture and of social sympathies. Economics is a deeply human subject.

The problems that face us today in the political and industrial fields are at bottom problems in economics. Immigration, child labor and the position of women in the industries, wages and sweat shops, standards of living for wage earners, the problem of a contented citizenship, general education and an intelligent electorate, all are essentially economic questions or vitally related to economic conditions. The teacher of economics ought therefore to be one of the most human of men, and the college should recognize its departments of economics as on a par with the departments of sociology, history and religion, in human interest. The college, moreover, ought to help to steady society in times of social and industrial unrest.

Of course, the influence of the men who walk in the groves of academies will not be profoundly felt, but it may nevertheless be profound. Students of history should gain perspective and a resulting poise and calmness of judgment concerning present issues and present agitation. Those ignorant of history or forgetful of the hole of the pit whence we have been digged may be forgiven an exaggerated estimate of present conditions, but scholars should be emancipated from such intellectual provincialism. The times in which we live are serious and we face problems of unprecedented proportions. Doubtless the outcome of present industrial struggles will be of far-reaching influence. But the problems of the present, grave as they are, are no graver than those our forbears faced and are strikingly similar in fundamental significance.

It is clearly the function of the college, then, to bring to bear upon the present the light of the past. Principles need ever to be restated for the sake of emphasis and of clearness.

Nor should college men hesitate to face present questions nor shrink from possessing conclusions concerning present issues. Scholars owe to society the obligation of making the venture of even tentative judgments and of furnishing such guidance as is possible in the mazes of current passionate struggles and discussion. Such judgments will be subject to revision in the calmness of later days and in the light of current experience. Students must run the risk of being inconsistent and have the courage to change or modify opinions once strongly held.

Not many years ago the charge was justly made that students of history were not furnishing the guidance that should be expected in regard to present political problems. The world's great experiment in democratic government was being worked out for good or ill here in America, and students of history were not venturesome enough to form judgments and to express

such judgments concerning present, pressing problems.

A group of teachers and students, especially of American history, acknowledged the charge justified and accepted the challenge which it implied. Addressing themselves with courage to the task of coming up to date in their historical studies and research, they took the leadership properly belonging to them as students of history, and have rendered invaluable service to the state in many ways. The "scholar in politics" is no longer a joke. The student of history has come out from shadows of the grove of the academy, donned a business suit and taken his place and his chances with the men of action.

So should the student of economic science.

There will be risk. Instead of leaving him hopeless, hidebound in conservatism, the student's wide knowledge of history may and often does thoroughly emancipate him until he becomes courageous and may appear dangerously radical in bringing forth new programs for the new day. Every once in a while there comes a deadlock in the economic and industrial and governmental world, in the breaking of which there may come disaster and chaos. At such times there is needed the guiding hand of the scholar. To undertake the solution of the present problems in industry without the scholar's counsel would be folly. The scholar is often the victim of a sneer, but those charged with grave responsibilities in government and in industry, and the workers whose well-being depends so absolutely upon settlements being based on sound economic principles, usually recognize the value of the scholar's counsel.

And the counsel ought not to be withheld. Even if not asked for it should be given. The professor of civil or of mechanical engineering may wait till his advice is sought. Only economic values are, for the most part, directly concerned. But the student of economic science deals with values primarily in their human and social relations. The well-being of society and of the

state depends upon the social sanity of its citizens. Economic folly means human suffering and waste to an appalling degree. A scientific physician may not be indifferent to the presence of disease-breeding conditions. Whether his counsel is asked or not, whether society is aware of the menace or not, it is his duty to "cry aloud and spare not," till rational remedies are applied. And the economic physician may not hold his peace in the presence of peril. To do so is to incur social guilt.

Now, it goes without saying that in the attempt to fulfill his social duty the economist may be subject to criticism and even to harsh action. He must run the risk.

In general, however, it should be said that society, and those in responsible relations to college administration, trustees, benefactors and executives, are not disposed to be hectoring and hampering in their treatment of an aggressive and fearless man, provided he has good sense, is tactful and possessed of genuine social passion. Probably nine-tenths of the tragedies, or at least dramatic denouements, in which some professor is seen temporarily to pose as a social martyr before he sinks out of sight on the lecture platform, are due to a crass lack of common sense on his part.

Falling in with some army officers in a dining car, while we were still in war, I found them to have been students of a university from which a courageously radical, but perhaps not unsound, teacher of economics had been asked to retire by the university authorities. These students of the professor liked him immensely, and for the most part seemed to accept his theories. At least, they thought the theories worth working out and testing. But their unanimous verdict as to the chief cause of the disturbance and expulsion was that the professor himself was a "d—— fool." This was about the judgment I had already reached from information coming through the press and through academic channels.

Doubtless prophets are needed—a few—who would

not function well as college professors. The rank and file of teachers are not called to be prophets. Amos would probably have failed of election to almost any faculty for which he might have been nominated. But the veriest teacher of economic science should have capacity for appreciating the prophet and sharing his vision.

II. President J. L. McConaughy, Knox College.

This topic is close to the hearts and minds of all of us. There is no college president here who has not spent weary hours figuring budgets, salaries, shrinkage of endowment funds, and the other usual presidential worries, all of which are influenced by the economic situation, or the high cost of living, as we more frequently call it. To solve these problems, nearly all the colleges in the country are now carrying on financial campaigns, totaling, we are told, one-third of a billion dollars. Will you permit me to mention, as one of the most obvious facts connected with the general economic situation in the colleges, that many of us will not be able to raise the great funds we sometimes blatantly announce. I would not be classified as a prophet of failure; but I do feel that the college that I have the honor to represent, at least, needs to study its possible resources most intensely before committing itself to a campaign amounting to millions. College presidents today mention millions with less awe than they used in talking of tens of thousands five years ago; may it be true that as our speech has changed, so likewise our ability to open pocketbooks; but I doubt it.

There would be, I think, a 100 per cent agreement among us as to the results to the colleges from the high cost of living. The productive value of our endowments has shrunk; the cost of operation has mounted sky-high. We must have more money to avoid deficits and to raise salaries. These results of the economic situation are

obvious; our time this evening may be better spent in considering the relation of the colleges to the causes of the economic situation. Are the American colleges in any slight degree responsible for this situation within themselves? Is there any way we can prevent the ill, instead of calling for the doctor? It will be admitted at once that the colleges have little relation to the general causes of the economic situation; these are national and international in scope. There are, however, one or two questions we should ask before making our appeals for aid.

First, are we making our customers, the students, pay their just share of the increased costs? If tuitions have not been raised to a figure that is a fair proportion of the cost, we have no right to appeal for outside aid to cover the resulting deficits.

May I remind you that in this and the following discussion we are thinking of the college, and not the university or the professional school. In general, college students should pay one-third to one-half of what their instruction costs. Students should pay, in every sort of institution, every cent that board and room actually cost. Is our college cutting rates educationally, giving its instruction "cheap," at a mere fraction of its cost? If this is the situation I, if I were a hard-headed business man, would hesitate to make up the resulting deficit. The principle in the privately endowed college, supported by its alumni, its friends, or its denomination, is entirely different from the principle in the state university, where the support comes from public taxation and the tuition is merely nominal.

What has just been said regarding a fair tuition rate and dormitory rates that fully cover the expense, does not mean that there should be no place for the poor, deserving student who can not pay the rates we have announced. We should provide scholarship aid for him large enough to cover the right proportion of the tuition and other charges which are made for rich and

poor alike. Personally, I believe we should do much more than many of us do now, for the able boy or girl of brains and grit; to provide only "jobs" for them is a doubtful solution. To force a boy who has a Phi Beta Kappa brain to wash windows or dishes three or four hours a day to pay for his education is not good public policy. The superior boy who needs scholarship aid ought to get enough money to allow him plenty of time to profit fully from his studies. Likewise, the dull, stolid students should usually not be encouraged through scholarships to make the fight for a college education. Is it over-bold to say that too many of them are trying to do it?

Second, is our college extravagant in its operation or equipment? Extravagance and waste are two of the greatest causes of our present economic problem. No college has a moral right to appeal for more aid, if it can not guarantee that it is carefully and economically operated. It is as essential to have our books properly audited as it is to offer freshmen Latin.

Can we guarantee that all gifts have been used for the purposes intended; that there has been no juggling of figures? Furthermore, what is it costing us to raise our big endowment funds? Are we taking more than two per cent to five per cent of the gift to pay for the expenses incurred in securing it? Are we preventing overlapping in instruction? Can we show that our college is not guilty of waste, which no business man would permit? Do we keep open-minded for new devices and economies in operation, making every dollar go as far as it can? Do we operate on a budget system, accounting specifically for every item of income and expense, so that we know where we stand, financially, all the time?

Extravagance in college equipment is probably rare. Certain interesting questions may be raised on this point, however. In the dormitories which we are building, how elaborate should be the facilities provided?

Should we have rooms with private bath for college students, few, if any, of whom have enjoyed such luxury at home? Should we allow fraternities to erect houses, regardless of cost, amounting sometimes to hundreds of thousands of dollars, and providing club facilities, the like of which few members ever have enjoyed and perhaps ever will again? The American college of yesterday provided rather stern, severe living facilities; are we in danger of swinging the pendulum too far the other way today? Can it be justly charged that our college students are learning to evaluate life on the financial basis alone? Are the alumni whom we praise to our students usually those who have made big salaries? In this age, when each college is trying to have better facilities than its sister colleges, we may be starting on the road to extravagance.

Third, is there any danger from an unthinking furor for salary raising? What should be the underlying principle for this economic necessity? What would be extravagance in raising college teachers' salaries? To some this may seem ridiculous. We all agree that our teachers should be paid enough at least to be relieved of financial worry. A teacher who has to scheme about how to make both ends meet or who has to spend hours every day washing dishes, is sadly decreasing his value to his college. Paying him enough is selfishly sound. How high should we try to put teachers' salaries? Are we justified in trying to get every cent we can to raise salaries?

In this matter I believe the colleges, particularly west of New England, have to face a somewhat different situation from the state universities and the professional schools and the great eastern institutions. If a college amounts to anything at all, it gives its faculty certain opportunities which the universities can not fully provide. I trust college teaching will never become a lucrative profession, financially attractive. I hope no one will ever enter it without realizing that some sac-

rifice will result. A teacher ought always to be worth more than he is paid; if he is paid what he is worth, he is overpaid. Teaching has been an altruistic profession; I trust it will always be so. The real teacher enjoys his work, and part of his compensation is the enjoyment from what he is doing. The ditch digger, who today, alas! is often paid more than the teacher, digs ditches in order that he may get money and leisure enough for his enjoyment, outside his work. Work which is itself intrinsically a pleasure will never be paid as much as work which is distasteful or merely routine. Do college presidents have the same fun in their jobs that college teachers have? I sometimes wonder. Perhaps that is why they are paid somewhat more!

Comparing salaries in teaching and in the professions is a popular method of showing the effect of the economic situation on the colleges. There is some doubt what should be the average faculty salary next year. The "Efficient College," described before this Association four years ago, called for an average faculty salary of \$2,100; the change in living costs would probably mean that this sum should be at least \$3,000 or \$3,200. It may be worth while to remember that nine out of ten manufacturers fail to make \$3,000; that four out of every five lawyers receive less than \$3,000; that fifty per cent of all doctors, architects, mine owners and brokers have to be content with an income less than this; throughout the country, only one out of every 325 people receives \$3,000 or over. Until recently \$3,000 was the salary of the assistant secretary of the treasury in Washington; some state governors receive less than this. In a college town of 25,000 until a month ago no bank cashier received \$3,000; only one minister now receives as large a salary.

What percentage of the parents of our students have to work for or receive an income of less than \$3,000, would be an interesting query. I have been told that for most of us the answer would be that a quarter to a third

of all the parents of our college students have an income of less than what has been proposed for our faculty. My inquiry is perfectly sincere. To what figure are we justified in raising salaries by money that is secured by appeals for aid for underpaid workers? If \$2,500 is a large salary in the community, can we logically ask for gifts to raise the average above \$3,000?

Every college that is raising salaries faces one difficult problem. Practically every college, with its present underpaid faculty, has some teachers who are not worth more that you are now paying them. If we raise salaries, should we raise the compensation for the inefficient teacher? Oftentimes the new salary that we are proposing would bring to us a superior teacher from outside. A flat raise to all the faculty of 25 per cent or $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent or 50 per cent would in most cases, I believe, mean that some of the teachers were overpaid. To refuse to increase the salaries of such men, frankly because they are not worth more, always means embarrassment to the college president. However, I firmly believe it is our duty to do this; otherwise we ourselves will be extravagant, paying more than such teachers are worth.

Finally, the economic situation will not be solved until we have more men in the business world with sharpened minds and keen consciences. An educational institution that turns out clever crooks is a liability to progress, not an asset. Business problems and the relations between capital and labor will not be solved by men with keen brains alone; they must have sterling character, too; ability and willingness to see the other side, to practice the Golden Rule.

To produce this training I believe the Christian college is supreme. I believe the day is at hand when we should assert our claim for the training of noble-minded business men, who will serve their fellow men, not in the schoolroom or the pulpit, but in the whirl of business life. The Christian college for decades has been

the great training school for teaching, preaching and social service, and Christian work here and abroad. State universities, with their tens of thousands of students, have sent out pitifully few leaders in these fields. But the present situation has changed. Until recently 50 per cent of all Knox graduates went into teaching, permanently or for a year or two; we offered courses to prepare them for service in this field. If 10 per cent of this year's class teaches next year, I shall be surprised. Where are they going? Into business, girls and boys.

Should we not give them, as we do the teachers, a direct preparation for that work? Few will secure any professional training after their college course is done. If our Christian colleges can adequately prepare business men and women and can give them the sterling character that has been the earmark of the graduate of a Christian college, we shall be striking at the basic causes of the economic situation; we shall make our colleges training camps, not for fighters, but for leaders in the great business world of tomorrow.

PROF. BLAISDELL: May I ask a question of Dr. McConaughy? Those figures that you gave as to the earnings of the medical profession, are they authoritative?

DR. McCONAUGHY: They are taken from the January number of the American Magazine.

THE POST-WAR CURRICULUM

I. Dean Mary A. Molloy, College of Saint Teresa.

Time was, whenever the curriculum came up for discussion, that the issue seemed pitched between the adherents of the humanities on the one hand and the advocates of vocational training on the other. Whatever was wrong with the young persons turned out of our colleges was wrong because they had had either too little or too much of the classics or of the manual and

industrial arts. And business and practical life and the schools were the crucibles in which the product was tried. And we shall all have to admit that as far as public opinion went the crucible test seemed to develop, on the part of the employing public especially, a prejudice against the college.

A young person who applied for a position the day after commencement was found some time later to have had so much practical training and so little of what was fondly regarded as cultural in the ante-Bolshevik days that he was not deemed "a growing man" by the head of the firm, be the firm industrial or educational. Another young person would find that all his fine sympathy engendered through four years of communion with the "sad, unhappy, far-off days and battles of long ago," was worse than wasted. Why had the old dean given him a smoky torch instead of an electric flashlight to illumine his steps? Why had he not been shown the romance of empire building, and why had he not been made to feel the thrill of the revolutionizing of industry as these wonders are going on in his own day and age? He muses. He would have taken this or that "practical" course if it had "counted for credit."

Due to the reaction and counter-reaction of business and the professions on education, we find ourselves drifting along in the easy-going faith that one subject is as good as another and may be elected at will; and what is the difference between basket-weaving and vector analysis—each is three semester points? And now in these late happy days of self-determination which can be represented by the equation, a degree equals 120 semester points, we find that students will omit one course rich in cultural content because it is scheduled for mid-afternoon, and they will ignore the appeal of another illuminating in practical value because the class meets on Saturday.

The result, as we find it revealed in the graduating classes, is at best a dead level of mediocrity. There is

no special distinction in manner or speech, much less in habit of thought of the newly-made bachelor of arts. And after four years spent in the ostensible purpose of acquiring these distinctions, this is rather a serious waste of time and effort on the part of hundreds of young men and women to whom, if to any, the public looks for the courage and the ability not to follow in the world's work, but to lead.

Whence will our leaders come if not from the colleges?

Now I am going to be radical to the extent of saying that there is not so great need to change the content of the post-war curriculum as there is need to change the administration of the individual courses of study.

We can not ignore the appeal of the practical or vocational courses if we would save the college from extinction; we dare not overlook the claim of the humanities if we would save a civilization from decay.

We find at every turn a generous interest to supply the machinery of education, but where the supreme lack seems to be is in the failure of this elaborate machinery to yield commensurate results.

I would enumerate the chief causes of the failure of the college to pay its dividends in service to the community as follows:

1. Lack of real inspiration in a great amount of the so-called teaching that is done.

2. Failure to discipline the students by requiring careful, steady, accurate, painstaking work.

3. The disposition to enervation that is brought about by working down to the students in easy courses rather than risk unpopularity by maintaining rigid standards of mature, vigorous and well-balanced thought.

4. The prevalence of too frequent and too frivolous diversions that stultify the aspiration for entertainment of a more intellectual and less sensational order.

5. The over-emphasis of the just claims of recreation as opposed to the under-emphasis of the vitalizing value of hard work.

6. The size of the classes. The classes are too large to permit the individual guidance on the part of the instructors without which college teaching ceases to be a creative art but degenerates instead into occupational drudgery.

Unless the American College of Liberal Arts has a special mission, unless it serves adequately a distinct need, it will surely and swiftly become a topic for antiquarian research.

It has a special mission. This mission is the moulding of its students through discipline of mind and body for the business of world leadership.

The professional schools, law, medicine, education, are very willing to admit that the leaders in the professions are those who have brought to the professions not only the special skill or training of the calling but the broad, deep and thorough training, in addition, which it is the special business of the course in liberal arts to impart.

There is much to do, or rather to undo, in order to achieve the results that will save the college and restore it to its onetime position of acknowledged usefulness and unquestioned prestige. It is not difficult to point out the special weaknesses which the public expects the college to correct. Once these weaknesses are clearly recognized, it will not take long to correct them if we are willing to adopt toward the student body a kind but firm policy—a policy that will secure to them something of the seriousness and poise and balance and breadth of understanding and wisdom, in a word, in which at present they are so pitifully lacking.

The free and easy policy of non-interference advocated by Rousseau has resulted in the conversion of the fourth commandment. The college has followed in the wake of the modern home in which parents live on sufferance and the whims of the children become the law.

The colleges for lack of educational discipline are turned topsy-turvy and the public arraigns both faculty and students before the bar of accountability, and like the angry

Duchess and with as little inquiry into real causes screeches to all comers, "Off with their heads".

The colleges will suffer a fate analogous to that of the fabled Frankenstein if they do not singly and collectively make their individualities felt on the youth who throng their campuses. And the most salutary way of making themselves felt is by becoming positive factors in the upbuilding of the students. In too many instances the college experience is merely another form of diversion to which young persons are exposed.

College students must be subjected to the discipline of work. They must be trained to discernment in recreation. They must be educated to the duty of obedience.

Students must be made to work, and be made to work hard, and they must be made to like to work. We must arrange to have smaller classes and assignments that can not be skimmed. I believe the lecture plan as we find it so commonly exemplified is not suited to freshman and sophomore students. Under it there is too much room for the easy-going *dolce far niente* that so strongly characterizes our college going youth. I will even go so far as to say that the type of instructor we most need is the constructive task-master.

There must be a decided revolution in student recreations. The cultivated taste of the college student should lead him or her to something more intellectual than the constantly frequented movie and to something less stimulating to the senses than the jazz, the musical comedy and the average college dance. College is not a lark. Life and leadership are serious burdens. The preparation for both must be made a serious apprenticeship kindly but firmly directed. I am convinced that once applied, this regime of more work, and harder work, and better work, and less play—the students will not only "like it" but they will respond promptly and generously to the interest which they will find is not passive and general but active, personal and individual. Moreover, students will learn to quiet the restlessness that is fast becoming our national menace, physically and spiritually.

No leader ever led who did not first learn the value of obedience. College students must learn obedience and respect for authority. They must abandon their belief in the supremacy of the individual judgment and they must be taught to direct their reason and conduct in the light of ultimate truth.

And all this college students can not find out for themselves. It must be shown them; it must be lived for them by those to whom their teaching is entrusted. The college teacher must be a person of great individual power, intellectual and spiritual. He can not be the pedant who would obscure the richness of content in his subject by the elaborateness of his pedagogical machinery.

You have doubtless all read the charming essay "The Importance of Being a Professor" in the December number of the *Atlantic Monthly*. The writer takes thought of himself very seriously in the light of certain revelations furnished him in the test papers by his students. He questions closely the premises on which rests the conclusion that his like is necessary to the community and therefore entitled to certain perquisites and prerogatives. It is a circle with a prolonged radius that will include at one pole the *Atlantic Essay* of 1919 and the teaching and practice of ancient China. According to the Chinese practice the master was held responsible for his pupil and in the case of certain offences of which the pupil may have been found guilty, his master was executed with him. Payment by results is the keynote of both illustrations. In the case of the *Atlantic* essayist, he acknowledges the pitiable results of his teaching and will hereafter cease to complain of the payment.

The all too common expression that "college doesn't hurt one, anyhow", implies negligible if not negative results.

The college teacher must be as never before guide, philosopher and friend to his students. His teaching must be real and the results, which are now in too many cases little better than negligible, must be made significant. Let us get together a band of teachers—I emphasize the beauti-

ful word teacher—the one who shows the way—in preference to professor. We do not need instructors with the professorial slant nearly as badly as we need instructors with the old inspiration and the old ambition to pass on to the youth before them the rich garnerings gleaned from years of patient intercourse with the best and truest of all that went before them.

The mission of the college teacher is a sacred one. It is his to quicken the finer perceptions, to fashion the finer taste, to correct the errant judgment and to indicate the true and stable center for the manifold eccentricities that are the natural accompaniment of the reckless blind speed of the mechanical, materialistic age in which we live. It was a Frenchman who, in a moment of great reverence, defined philosophy as the amalgamation of all the sciences, the golden cloud which bears the soul to heaven. Every college teacher must be a true philosopher. He must show his subject in its true relations to all other subjects. He must neither exaggerate nor minimize its importance in the scheme of things. And this is the crowning of his scholarship. But if in addition to this he fails to wing the spirits of his students heavenward from whatever promontory he stands, be it history, literature, science, politics or industry, he would better be a carpenter, a milliner or a tea-room expert.

The college teacher must be ever mindful of the fact that his mission is a privileged one of arduous work and duty and not an essay at popular entertainment.

I believe we are too anxious about the size of the enrollment and the number in the graduating classes. There is too much of the flavor of the factory about our colleges. Our estimates lean almost wholly to quantity of production rather than to quality. Quantity looks well in print and the size of the "plant" impresses the visiting committee which surveys before the appropriations are made. The students seem to have the idea that almost anything will be condoned provided the institution is made and kept "popular". The annual commencement orator graciously

addresses the largest class in the history of the institution and all too many on commencement day carry away only the husk of learning to go on and out to treat all learning as if it were nothing but husks. It may prove a real disaster to a college to attempt to achieve popularity if this popularity results in the lowering of entrance requirements, the easing up of course requirements and the encouragement of the limousine drive for the degree.

We must learn to be content with fewer numbers and to let those who do not like a stiffened regime drop out. Their presence is only a detriment. We have too many young persons with no particular endowments and with no definite purpose crowding our colleges to-day.

With too little protest we have allowed ourselves to be deflected from our proper path by the pressure from the peoples' university—the American High School. The American High School will hold its own. It behooves the American College to take thought to its own individuality and do likewise.

With a stiffened regime and with great teachers who will create an atmosphere of work and study and refinement of mind we will find the most desirable students in the high schools anxious to qualify. They will be glad to come up to our standards and to our requirements. It was another Frenchman who said that a cat does not caress us; it merely caresses itself against us. With a stiffened regime, kindly, firmly and wisely administered we will no longer have the uneasy feeling that we exist merely to be rubbed against.

Each college should aim to develop and retain an individuality. It should be able to impart some subtle distinction that will differentiate its students from all others. Collectively we should endeavor to build up among the students devotion to the college of their first choice. There is, especially in the middle and northwest, too much restless moving about from one institution to another. No institution, no matter how conscientious and physically efficient, can do its best by those who come to it if they are continually on tiptoe ready to flit somewhere else where work

is reported to be easier and diversions more frequent and alluring. In this way each college would be given a fair show to do its best or worst by its students and it would rise or fall in public estimation as it succeeded or failed to turn out students who can produce results. Under the migratory system, common at present, much shabby work and careless conduct acquire a measure of respectability when students pass as easily as at present from one institution to another.

With a stiffened regime and with great teachers our curriculum will not fail by defect. Our program of studies should be such as will furnish a broad and stable foundation for purposeful living. I would recommend that the program in its main outlines be carefully prescribed. It should include certain well-organized and difficult courses in history and politics, in classical and modern literature, in science and mathematics and in philosophy. To this should be added courses which while not intended to directly prepare for vocational or professional careers will at least engage the intelligent sympathy of students for the industrial environment into which, whether they like it or not, they will inevitably find themselves borne.

It is quite possible to make a vocational program full and rich and complete, if it is under the direction of scholarly teachers who will realize the necessity of building it on a foundation of prescribed humanities. Now then if we help our students plan their courses so that the lover of the humanities may leave college with an insight into and a sympathy for the work of the vocationist and if the college trained vocationist is made to realize that something more than dollars is the measure of worth and success we will at once obliterate the contrast which is far from helping the case of the college—the contrast between the one-sided intellectual and the vocational superficialist.

If the post-war curriculum will give the students vision through discipline; and sympathy with their fellow-men through understanding; and sincerity in word and purpose

and action through appreciation of truth; if it will give them fortitude through faith in God; and a love of service and the ability to impart to work however humble the grace that lifts it to the plane of art, the college of liberal arts will need no defense. It will be again, but more abundantly, the great mother of leaders, the inner bulwark of our civilization.

II. President William W. Guth, Goucher College.

One of the evils the war has brought in its train is a seeming necessity to engage in an over-anxious discussion of about everything under the sun. It would be commonplace and out of style to look upon anything that was before the war as fit and proper for the needs of today. Because the guns boomed and made a great noise and caused untold devastation, we have assumed that the face of the earth has been changed and man's thoughts forced into a different channel. This is true only in part; the face of the earth has really not been changed, the mountains stand, the valleys are unmoved, the rivers still run to the sea, and most important of all, human nature has the same aspect and presents the same problems. As the material of the steel-worker is fluid iron, so the subject of the thinker is human nature. The war has not so much presented new problems as it has thrown a spot light upon the old. There has been a new emphasis, of course, and new methods have been and will be discovered. Thought will be centered upon making impossible a recurrence of the causes that led to the invasion of a neutral country and the forcing of war upon an unsuspecting world. But the mind of man is so fertile and so subtle that while we are busy driving the causes of 1914 out of the door, causes of 1924 or 1940 may fly in at the window. We have the same lesson to learn today that we had to learn a decade ago and that our fathers had to learn last century or in the year one.

An educator has recently declared that up to date we have made as great an expenditure for education as we have for railroads, and that we are getting the same large

dividends from education as have come from the railroads, these latter being not only in the form of a check but also in the fact of the material advancement and the extension of our country. Not to make too much of the analogy, there are those who believe there will be a decided falling off or an entire cessation of dividends if the railroads continue to be controlled by the government and conducted on the basis of a war emergency. And so any attempt to standardize education, or bring our educational institutions under the control of a sameness superimposed by a forced consensus of opinion and carried out in the nightmare of a war necessity would soon deplete the spiritual surplus on which we can now draw for dividends.

There are two things in all our discussion of educational problems that we dare not lose sight of. The *first* is that we live in a democracy and are tremendously concerned, therefore, about having a form of government so safe for our own interests and obligations that we can strike a match anywhere. Education, formal education, I mean, may soon find that its problem is not the post-war curriculum at all, but the democracy that was forced into the open and brought under trial by the war. And the *second* thing that we must remember is that we not only live under a democratic form of government, but that our country is wide and diversified and demands an educational system as firm on the fundamentals as the Constitution of the United States, let us say, but also sufficiently elastic to meet the needs and conform to the changes of the body politic. The Constitution reserves certain federal or national rights and prerogatives and concedes certain state or individual initiative and sovereignty. For more than a century and a quarter this constitution, matchless among charters since the world began, has stood the test, it has kept democracy safe, and shows today no weakening of its power or diminution of its force.

So I would look upon the constitution of the educational idea in our country. There are certain sovereign or fundamental rights which education holds as inalienable,

they are constitutional and dare not be violated. These rights center in the obligation to train the youth of our land to habits of clear, straight, sound, dispassionate and honest thinking and living. There are others of equal force and effect as long as they do not contravene the fundamental or constitutional rights. For example, practically every discussion concerning education today grows out of the conflict, so-called, between humanism and science, or between the cultural as over against the vocational emphasis in training. Now these are separate and distinct problems in education just as the hands and the feet are separate members of the body. They have their peculiar functions, but not in or for themselves, only for the complete and the sound body. Or, to revert to our original analogy, they are states rights over against federal rights, the recognition of which preserves the constitution and furthers democracy. As soon as you put states rights over and above national rights, or presume to put down states rights by the force of federal power, there will be disturbance and conflict. So as soon as you pick out certain subjects and place them over others, you cause confusion and uncertainty. I mean, of course, fundamental subjects and not the frills or fringes than can be brought into the educational scheme. There is a place for the classical or cultural course and a place for the vocational or technical course in our educational plan. There is no place, however, in educational discussion for the ridicule or depreciation of the advocates of the one by the advocates of the other. Let the classicist and the "technicist" each have the courage of his convictions and walk resolutely and erect down the middle of his chosen road, for he has a right to it, it has been carefully surveyed, is well laid out and paved, and, whether it runs up and down the mountains or over the plains, will bring him in the end to the city of efficient training, toward which the road of his brother also leads.

The problem we are discussing is not so much the post-war curriculum as the curriculum each particular insti-

tution ought to emphasize. It would be a pity if Amherst and Haverford and Princeton, for example, which emphasize the arts, should undertake to do what Purdue and Lehigh and The Massachusetts Institute of Technology do for technical training. It would be a pity if our great state universities or Harvard and Stanford, emphasizing both the arts and sciences, should not continue to do so. To get a strict classical education or a strict technical education a young man need not go to a cultural or a vocational college. He can go to a state university or one of our well endowed private universities and get either an arts or a science course and get it in a thorough-going way. All he needs is the right kind of advice and the right sort of direction. There are a sufficient number of Amhersts in our country emphasizing the arts, and Purdues emphasizing the sciences, as well as state and privately endowed universities, emphasizing both the arts and sciences, to give a boy an opportunity to get the sort of training he desires. It is mainly a question as to whether it is best for him to throw himself into a large or small student body or whether he can choose to go to a distant part of the country or must remain nearer at home.

The fallacy and the foolishness of much of our educational endeavor grow out of the fact that colleges, or universities, so-called, which have neither funds nor equipment to give a first-class cultural or a first-class technical training undertake to give both. Many of these institutions could give excellent preparatory training as Junior Colleges for the advanced work of a near-by university, and thereby keep faith with their students. But because of denominational or local pride they go on trying to duplicate equipment and courses which only large funds can command, and which a well equipped institution a few miles away has in full running order. Here is economic waste as well as educational shortsightedness, and hence a blow at one of the fundamental principles of democracy.

My answer to the question: "What shall the post-war curriculum be?" is that every institution which has a right

to invite the youth of our land to its halls for the training of mind and hand and will, should in modesty and humility, perhaps in sack cloth and ashes, set itself to ascertain what its funds will enable it to do, and then with a purpose so charged with the dynamic of honesty that will make certain the result, proceed to the accomplishment of that thing.

ARCHITECTURE

Henry K. Holsman

When that far-off poet wrote in Genesis of how the Creator made the heavens and the earth and all that in them is, he pictured the divine motive to be chiefly the joy of doing the work. He applied the artist's test at the end of each day, and as if we might forget that the creation was a divine work of art, he repeated the test for the seventh time; "and God saw all that he had made and behold it was very good." But have we not forgotten? Have we not riveted our attention so much upon the things of life and the possession of them, that we have forgotten why they were made? Have we not been so busy with the mechanics and the institutions of life that we have forgotten life itself?

Recently a boy came to my office to collect a bill for a firm making blue prints of drawings. I noticed that the right sleeve of his cheap and shabby coat was empty and I thought him a poor collector for such a firm. "I'll send a check next Tuesday," I said. He leisurely wrote a memorandum with his left hand, then turning to some drawings on the wall, asked if he might look at them. When he was about to go I asked, "Why are you so interested?" "I am studying art at night school," he said, "and I am having lots of fun with it because the teacher seems to depend on me to help the other fellows, for he is really a manual training teacher and knows very little about art." "Where did you learn about art?" I asked, "Well, I went to Sunday school two years, in St. Paul. Our teacher was an architect. They were building a new church at the time, and he showed us

a lot of interesting things about the building, how the carvings and decorations were made and what they meant. There were three figures carved on the pulpit, one of them was holding a cup of the devil's. The artist had carved a cunning snake up out of the cup, turning over the edge. Some one found this snake who did not understand, and I guess the authorities decided it was not proper to have a snake in the church. We used to march by, close up to the pulpit, and one day the snake was gone. I slipped my fingers into the cup and felt the little stump that the carver left when he cut out the snake. They spoiled the whole thing, took all the beauty out of it. I got so disgusted that I went away. I've been to lots of places since then, and have seen lots of churches and other things. There were nineteen kids in that class; they are all employed in some kind of art work now, drafting, furniture or pottery. I am the only black sheep, and I think if I can learn to draw, I can design something too.

"I am having lots of fun now. I'm designing a great church—just imagining it all, you know. I found a location on a point running out into a bay, the people are all sailors. They can't read much, but they love the towers, arches and symbols. I'm having lots of fun with the towers. I am making them this way," as he sketched the design. "I am setting them diagonally and I am making the thrust of the arch go down this pier and balancing it by the weight of this. A little light crosses the nave, and a stronger one at the transept, and a fainter light again at the choir, making the church seem much longer than it really is, like the English, you know, while it is really very wide, like the French."

"I've changed my mind about sending that check," I said. "I will not pay the bill until you call again." In due time he came again, and I was convinced that even a ragged waif, with an appreciation of art, could be a good collector.

With this abbreviated narrative as a parabolic syllabus, may I not make a plea for a systematic, scientific study and development of art in our American colleges—a plea for such a study and investigation as the college has given to

medicine, that has wiped out so many plagues and has just eliminated typhoid from our army. Such an investigation as is given to science, that created the mechanics to perform our mighty works and wiped out the oceans that once separated people from people, and that now discovers even light to be a form of material we may yet learn how to use. All these and similar developments have been made possible by the study, research and training of appropriate colleges.

The casual observer could not have surmised that instantaneous combustion, in the hands of scientific college training, would enable us to sail the air better than the birds can fly; or that the lightning in the air, developed in the laboratories of our universities, would enable us to speak peace to all people, on land and sea, at the same instant. The colleges have developed these and a hundred other wonderful powers, from mere hints of the most elusive phenomena of nature, but have done nothing with that little understood, but long recognized phenomena, art.

Yet the waif of the street is transformed by that wireless transmission of beauty, that dazzling form of unknown energy, that vibrating energy of art that excites the normal activity of the senses, attunes the latent instinctive being, and quickens that functional activity that distinguishes man from beast, and breathes into him that divine power we call the soul of the race.

We build museums like mausoleums, and, like true mourners, we gaze upon the outward forms of ancient beauty from which the life has long since gone, and lament the lost arts. Let us turn these museums into laboratories of "psychological aesthetics," for the discovery, investigation, capture and application of this marvelous energy of art, to the development and supreme happiness of all our people. Who knows but that in the process we may not stumble into a scientific appreciation of that other imperious power, love, and make its law, also, of universal, practical application in our daily lives.

Art, like all other phenomena, has various aspects, and numerous means of manifestation. To the literateur or

philosopher it is the expression or embodiment of beautiful, elevated thought, imagination or feeling; in language, painting or sculpture; through harmonic suggestion, latent in the medium used. This is perhaps the flower of art, but it has been plucked from the stem, and its roots among the people have long since died of neglect.

To the scientist and naturalist, art is the bringing of nature down to a plane comprehensible by man.

To the religious-minded, art is the revelation of man in his striving after perfection of execution, while nature is the revelation of God in the perfection of creation. "A race which has a vital message to impart will deliver it in its architecture." Art will carry the message, whether it be significant or meaningless, worthy or unworthy.

To the industrial and mechanical world, art is the attempt to achieve the individual's conception of perfection, to achieve beauty, to form the material so that it fulfills the function reasonably, as you feel it would, could the material understand and rise exultantly to meet the duty with just enough movement, and inherent force to do the thing—no more, no less. Thus, in architecture, the form seeks to achieve the harmonious balance of live forces of work and play, and the ornament serves to say how easily the work is done, or how rhythmically the play goes on.

In the voice of the people, art is not the subject, the plot or the product of man or nature, nor the work of the hand or brain, but the way we work or the way we play; it is loving, laughing, singing with all our might, and living with all our hearts. This aspect of art is at once our responsibility and our opportunity.

To him that hath ears, this is no small voice crying in the wilderness; it is a voice that says to the philosopher and literateur: Weed out the useless trash of plutocracy, hypocrisy and war in your libraries and tell us of the fullness of the brotherhood of man. To the industries it whispers: Your plants are not so many buildings, wheels and machines, however cleverly contrived and adjusted, but men and women of sentient muscle and nerve, who design and

operate them and who must have houses and homes and the amenities of life in order to function as manufactories. And to the colleges and schools it is crying, Give us not more cunning by which to exploit others, not more tools for fashioning commerce and industry of selfish ends. We admit that, coming into a world of physical surroundings, you must cultivate and protect our bodies and supply us with the mechanical extensions of the hand and senses; and perhaps a balanced equipment of observation, memory and motion, far beyond their natural limitations, is necessary. We admit that during the process of equipment the spirit expands and the intellect develops; but there comes a day when means must be used for ends, life begins, and the pleasure of preparation must give way to the joy of doing. If you teach us only how to gain equipment, and we are bent only on securing the material reward of things with which to live, and fail to live, all will be lost. While you are giving us this equipment, show us the way of life in the art of work and play.

The crying need for art in America has grown loud and insistent, and the rewards are so great, that the marvel is that millions have not flown to the colleges for the founding of art departments. That the demand is not met, means either that we can not understand the value of a phenomena we know so little about, or that those who hear and know are so niggardly selfish and shortsighted they will not respond.

We spent over one-half billion dollars on interior decoration the past year—not to mention millions in dress goods, fabrics, china, furniture, and so forth. All of this material embraced form, color and pattern, and sold primarily on the excellency of its design.

With the stimulus of our scientific and engineering colleges and the protection of our patent laws, our mechanical development has grown by leaps and bounds. With our lack of education in design and our neglect to encourage and protect the designer, our art industries have developed slowly, and practically only through the use of foreign state-

trained artists. When designs from abroad were unobtainable, some twenty years ago, our manufacturers began importing artists from France, Italy, Sweden, Holland and Germany, to create designs for them. It did not then occur to us to connect fabrics, house furnishings and jewelry with art schools. We knew of painting, but not that it was design in color and pattern; we knew of sculpture, but not that it was design in form. We had no schools with which to train designers—Europe had—and so long as the supply was adequate, we gave no thought to the future.

Then came the war; none noticed until then that nearly all our furniture and fabric designers came from Germany. These designers and artists have gone. The present hysterical demand for designs is exemplified by the distribution of \$2,100 in petty prizes and the greedy purchase of \$3,000 worth of textile designs, on the first day of the recent exhibit of the Art Alliance of America in New York City. That exhibit revealed many workers of great talent among recent arrivals from over-seas, and, incidentally, revealed a reprehensible trait, born of lack of appreciation and understanding of the fundamental soul of art—the ruthless beating down of the artists' prices, and hence, the beating down of his artistic standards, by applying, to extreme limits, the principle of buying cheap and selling dear, a thing that could not happen if the manufacturer and the merchant, as well as the artist, were trained together in the appreciation of art, in the same schools and colleges.

Hence the wail among manufacturers for art schools and incidentally, a scarcity of goods, poverty of design, and an unfortunate but needless factor in the high cost of living, an extravagance that will be many times greater than the cost of schools for artists and artisans, a waste that does not comport gracefully with national good taste.

But the fundamental demand for art is not so mean and tawdry as is this commercial demand for industrial design, great and important as it is. The vital demand is for training in public, democratic taste—a taste that is an active trait of life for the selection of things that are good, not

merely for things that are recognized by authority or test of time, but the active life-taste that results from knowledge of the relation of things, the life that requires clean, economical, orderly, beautiful homes and which is an active force against the reverse—dirt, disorder, waste and ugliness.

Sixty years ago Europe's aristocracy appreciated the value of industrial design and art, and spent millions in state and private schools for cultivating it, but the aristocratic statesmen could not see the necessity of universal education in art. Democracy, resting on public education, demands that all must be trained. To the three R's must now be added some taste. Like the three R's, taste can not be learned by merely talking about it, but by exercises and problems in which decisions must be expressed, in immediate needs, by a discriminative judgment, borne of many opportunities for choice. True appreciation of art, taste and judgment of values result from creative experiences, and the principal value of art lies in the act of production, not in the product.

Some pupils grow in taste rapidly, some slowly, as in the three R's, but always by the same process—choice by virtue of knowledge of what makes for the better form, color or pattern. Taste is not a selective faculty of definite standards, but a constructive capacity and habit of mind that seeks to sharpen its perceptions that it may judge, not that things are better or poorer, but how better and why poorer.

Our lamentable poverty in taste is expressed in our language. Everything in art is either fine, fierce or horrid, yet in a true democracy, where every producer is consumer, where every manufacturer is also buyer, national taste is as essential for the consumer as for the producer. We can never have a good national architecture or the best economical products until we have a tasteful public. Art training is as essential to the soul of democracy as the mother's milk to the babe in arms.

We betray our limitations of aesthetic reaction in everything we see and everything we do. We set a table, it is only

a design. We deck ourselves with ribbon or tie and we make a bit of a pattern. We are all walking designs of our own creation, and our homes stand to damn us or praise us by virtue of their design and the decorations we hang on the walls and spread on the floor. The business man is not more exempt; he must plan his shop, lay out his office, dress his counters and deck his windows. The manufacturer must handle design every step of the way from his first plan of the product until it is made, painted, boxed, labeled, displayed, and advertised in booklet or poster. He must solve these questions even though blindly and ignorantly, and frequently achieves atrociously bad design, because of his bad taste, the result of untrained aesthetic judgment, which can not help him to select the better from the poorer.

That each citizen must read and write, is regarded as a truism, but, to those who are not prepared for the inevitable and continual display of aesthetic judgment, that each of us is a designer, whether he knows it or not, comes with something of a shock, often so late in life as to be fatal. Among the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, there is an inexorable unwritten law: Every citizen is an artist in his own right, and is entitled to training in taste and design.

But, says one, why not continue the training of the naturally gifted in art, in separate art schools, apart from colleges, and let them give the people standards of taste and design? A noted Grand Opera director, discussing the tenor voice as a freak of nature, said: "It is not hard to find plenty of good voices, but it is almost impossible to find a good voice and a man in the same person." Freaks in art, music or mathematics seem to be a development of a particular capacity to the point of over-balancing the man. Training the naturally gifted in their overstressed talent, without training the balance of the faculties, is like making a bung hole without a barrel. You can pour in a great stream of precious fluid in a short time, but there is no way of getting it back when the time comes for making it of practical use. We must put the good wine into good bottles.

But, you insist, is not industrial design and public taste a matter for the common schools to handle? How can the rural colleges begin to teach such things, and what should be the immediate results if they did?

It would be presumptuous for me to advise an audience of college presidents on such matters; but, to the prospective public or private investor in education, I may presume to venture an opinion. To the investors I may say: "A few years ago when a need for physical training was manifested, you hastened to provide every college with a gymnasium and athletic field, and today there is an insatiable call for physical instructors and playground directors in the public schools. When the manufacturer wanted help for developing machines and industries, you established chemical and physical departments, and the books they produced are now popular in the common schools, and every industry is ruled by the dictates of college trained chemists, or electrical or mechanical engineers.

And what of the teachers? When the manufacturer or tradesman goes to the schools for vocational art, he finds all of the courses planned for entrance to the high school and college, and all instruction limited to what the teacher derives from college training. You can not change the curricula of the schools except at the colleges, whence all the teaching force comes.

But why wait for the schools to do, in the vital matter of art appreciation and public taste, what they have never done in any other branch of training? Place your millions behind the colleges, provide every college with a department of architecture, and let her mother all the other arts. If that sounds too pedantic, call it the chair of art appreciation and design, or, to be more democratic, the department of design and housing, for the house, if not the mother of the arts, shelters them all, and so long as the little mother sticks a feather in her hat or a flower in her raiment, there will be the fertile seeds of art planted.

Yes, found a department of public taste and found it deep and broad, with laboratories beyond the capacity of

the most gifted sons of the soil, in line, color and form, and found it quick.

The time is ripe, the laborers are few, or not at all. And what shall the harvest be? If you endow every virile college youth of our great rural lands with the spirit of the artist, the beneficent rain will at once descend upon all our schools and industries, to make them bloom like the rose. Endow our school superintendents and teachers with true aesthetic appreciation, and the school room will be transformed into real attractive life-patterns, where children are eager to go. Equip the dictators and managers of industries with the divine spirit of art, and the whole machinery of life will be directed to creating goods, for the joy of the user and producer alike.

Vitalize education of the people with the soul of creative art, and each citizen will find his place in group consciousness, and achieve his bit in the harmonious balance of the whole, while the rhythmic play of life goes on. When the citizen institutionally inherits the artist attitude, then, not what he gets, but what he gives, will be his chief concern. Then shall we have a true democracy, and each will do for the other what he knows the other will do for him, and be content.

This is no more impossible, Mr. Investor, than what you have already done in medical and mechanical science and other branches of education. Time was, almost within the memory of men now living, when electricity and other equally common, potent forces gave promise of no use whatsoever. You invested millions in science and it has returned a hundred, perhaps a thousand, fold. If you will now invest a few millions in psychological aesthetics, in the true spirit of art, the return will be at least as great, and with it will come a priceless by-product—a true automatic democracy of intelligence, peace and contentment.